

The American Historical Review

THESE FORTY YEARS ¹

IN this year of grace 1924 the American Historical Association celebrates the fortieth anniversary of its birth. Itself the product of a new and growing interest in historical study in America, it has become in this country the accepted promoter of historical work, giving point and direction to historical achievement, and acting as a clearing-house for historical ideas and enterprises. Also the years of its existence are coincident with great progress toward maturity and soundness of judgment in the historical world at large as well as in the United States, wherever history is studied or taught.

These forty years cover more than a generation in the lives of men and constitute a remarkable period of material and social development, of readaptation of the human race to the world in which it lives. During these years hardly a branch of human endeavor but has felt the spur of a new inquiry. Men have passed out of an age of intellectual and scientific adolescence into one of wider and more certain knowledge; they no longer grope empirically toward results, but reach them by carefully ascertained and tested processes, based on a growing familiarity with the laws of nature and the ultimate structure of matter. In the fields of medicine, surgery, pharmacology, physics, chemistry, and biology, a veritable revolution has taken place and the results have become so commercially valuable as to attract the attention even of those who are ignorant of the technical processes involved. Discoveries in these fields are set forth on the front pages of the newspapers, are popularized in readily accessible magazines and books, and soon become so much a part of the common understanding as to find place in conversation at the breakfast table and in casual social intercourse wherever two or three are gathered together. Men mold their lives in accordance with these results, which concern their every-day existence, increas-

¹ Address delivered by the writer, as acting president, before the American Historical Association at Richmond, Dec. 27, 1924.

ing their hopes of longevity, adding to the convenience and comforts of their lives, and widening enormously their interest in their own minds and bodies, and in the universe of which their own planet is but a small part. Life to-day, whether for better or worse, is fundamentally different from that of half a century ago, and even men of little intelligence and of limited powers of observation can see, hear, touch, taste, smell, and otherwise know of accomplishments in the fields of the exact sciences and in the realm of human inventiveness. They can grasp, somewhat less certainly perhaps, changes in governmental, social, and industrial organization, such as the passage from an agricultural to an industrial economy, the various adjustments arranged between capital and labor, the trend toward corporate ownership, lower costs, better results in production and distribution, and the decentralization and stabilizing of industry. They can understand also the enlargement of the electorate, the political activities of women, the place of labor in government, and the increase of the federal power.

The public at large has probably some inkling also of the advances made in religious and philosophical thought since the 'seventies, for one hears much about trials for heresy, the higher criticism, and the conflict between the fundamentalist and the modernist; and philosophy in its various forms has always had charms for the troubled human soul. In its relation to Darwinism and evolution, philosophy has become closely associated with scientific infidelity; and the sundry and various philosophical schools, capturing the interest of men by their various interpretations of life, have been able to teach most intelligent people something about philosophical concepts. Meanwhile the new psychology is kept before the public because of its embodiment in current fiction and its connection with criminal proceedings and the consequent notoriety that it obtains in the newspaper press. But however understandable these various subjects are to the average man, their technique and their scientific vocabulary are beyond him, a fact that makes him welcome the popularizer and respect the expert.

But history, with its vocabulary of every day, seems to be everybody's affair, and during these forty years no such popular deference has been paid to the opinion of historical experts as has been given to experts in other fields, where technique and vocabulary are more difficult for the layman to understand. While few would question that a revolution has taken place in other branches of knowledge, there are those who decry the work of the historical specialist, believing that every man can be his own historian. Hume, Gibbon,

Prescott, and Bancroft, and other writers of long ago are rated by the average man as equally scientific and as much deserving of confidence as the most advanced and best trained historians of the present day, and among the people at large there would appear to be no accepted standards or principles to which historical writing is expected to conform. It would seem, therefore, to be a fitting thing on this fortieth anniversary of our birth as an association to glance at the methods and work of the earlier historians and to ask ourselves the question whether these last forty years, which correspond so exactly with the age of science and the Darwinian philosophy, can show anything in history comparable with these in the way of higher canons of criticism and interpretation, better balanced judgments, and more rational methods of presentation. Men have reached new points of vantage from which to view the present and the future; have they reached similar points of vantage from which to view the past?

Few, I think, would question the statement of Leslie Stephen that the eighteenth-century group of historians lacked the capacity "to recognize the great forces by which history is moulded and the continuity which gives it real unity"; and that "they took but a superficial view, generally implying inadequate research and a complete acquiescence in the external aspect of events and the accidental links of connection, without any attempt to penetrate to the underlying and ultimate condition". One might add that their work in the field of history was as crude as that done in the fields of medicine, geology, chemistry, and biology during the same period. They were credulous, careless, and childish, blinded by their partialities and hatreds. Often they contented themselves with finely spun theories and dreams; again they did little more than make current a mass of fabulous anecdotes and traditional gossip, for which they received far too much credit, even when judged by the standards of their own day. They generalized unhesitatingly from single instances, and fabricated motives, often the most general or the most gross, to explain situations and events. They had no conception of what we know as evolution and took little or no account of changes in standards and ideals, of shifts in moral and ethical viewpoints, that is to say, of mental longitudes.

The great majority of the historians of the period before the middle of the nineteenth century wrote works that are of but little value to-day, and one can only wonder at the apparent ease with which their volumes were turned out and the eagerness with which they were read. As far as bulk and matter were concerned, they

were amazingly productive, and one marvels that publishers could be found to publish and readers to read the writings of such poly-histors as Laurent, Sismondi, and Barante. Also we doubt if the world will see, ever again, the like of Ranke with his forty volumes, Droysen, Lafuente, and Thiers with their thirty each, and Cantù with his twenty, many of which were written in the interims of political careers. Where did the men of the past get the time, money, and physical strength to perform such prodigious feats? Not all of them were content to be picturesque as was Prescott, commonplace as was Rollin, romancers as was Lamartine, or moralists as was Thomas Arnold. They faced serious tasks and wrote serious books, and for this reason their stupendous output fills the modern student with awe. It is true that there existed among them a certain amount of co-operation, particularly in France and Germany, where schools and institutes were coming into existence and great collections of sources were being planned and begun; but in the main these men grappled with their tasks single-handed and wrote more or less in isolation. Nowadays, works of such dimensions as theirs emanate from a bench or a group of benches and not from a single chair, and a universal history to win popular approval must be written in the style of the novelist as a substitute for fiction and appear in not more than two volumes!

Many of the historians of this period were satisfied to entertain their readers with sprightly and dramatic narrative, rich in style and glowing with color. Some aimed to enlighten or instruct, expounding the past as a record of events, concerning which the reader should be informed as a matter of education. Others construed history in terms of political progress, emphasizing the growth of liberty, democracy, parliamentary government, and constitutional ideas, and condemning as obstructive and evil the conservative forces of society. Many wrote to defend a creed or some form of religious organization, sometimes turning their histories into religious pamphlets by manipulating their facts in such a way as to justify a religious uprising or a religious state of mind. Still others, Tories or Whigs, Imperialists or Republicans, obsessed by national, racial, and political prepossessions, wrote to defend a party, a programme, or a government, and, using history as an armory of weapons with which to carry on the attack, selected their materials to suit their ends, stressing, omitting, and falsifying with impunity. Their volumes carried political propaganda just as their lectures inculcated political ideals. Though sometimes raising their narratives to high levels of historical accuracy, they could not avoid interpreting their

evidence in the interest of political causes, and blended history and politics in an astounding degree. One admires their industry, their colossal erudition—such as it was, their phenomenal memories, and their brilliant imaginations, but at the same time one is impressed with their lack of judicial impartiality and the frequency with which they used their talents for inferior ends—to prove, to justify, to defy, to glorify, or to abuse. The older historians always took sides and applied their knowledge to demonstrate something or other in politics, religion, or philosophy. Niebuhr, Droysen, Mitford, Grote, Alison, Macaulay, and Bancroft, for example, saw but one side of their respective subjects, and Arnold and Kingsley were but theologians in disguise. Vigorous partizanship undoubtedly accounts for much of the popularity of Macaulay and Carlyle, both in their own day and ours. Bias of this character is never specially harmful, for it is possible to discount it when found in such quantity, whether in the form of German patriotism, the British Whig heirloom, or the American belief in manifest destiny. In the final estimate what these men have left us is often great literature rather than great history.

Their descendants are still with us, a prolific race. We shall always have writers who utter commonplaces that pass for historical thinking, who deal in shop-worn ideas, and who stand as idolaters of stratified dogma in both politics and religion. There are those with so little appreciation of the changes which have taken place in mental and social conditions as to write of past heroes as if they were the statesmen and bosses of to-day, just as the writers of the seventeenth century reversed the process by clothing the chieftains of Frankish tribes in the wigs and ermine of Louis XIV. We shall always have history written in terms of race and ethnology, as in the case of the old-time theory of Anglo-Saxon supremacy, the forerunner of the equally dogmatic and uncritical Nordic theory of the present; in terms of excessive patriotism and dynastic loyalty, as if history were merely something subordinate to love of country or crown; and in terms of sectional animosity, at its height in this country in 1867, when Donald Mitchell wrote that “every soul that made utterance south of the Potomac was consigned straight to Hell, and everyone north of the same who voted the Republican ticket was consigned to Heaven”.

Gossip and love of anecdote, the outpourings of diarists and letter-writers, none too scrupulous of veracity, and the unverified assertions of the oldest inhabitants and other participators in the affairs of their time still form the structural material out of which

popular history is and will continue to be built to satisfy the needs of many of the world's population. Readers will form their impressions of the fifteenth century from the *Paston Letters*, of the age of Charles II. from Pepys's *Diary*, and of the eighteenth century from Walpole's letters and memories, the latter of which has been well called "an inappropriate title for a misshapen and scurrilous libel". Chroniclers and personal narrators have spread lies that the historian will never be able to run down, and autobiographers, even some of the most recent, have not always risen above the indulgence in malice that characterized the scandal-mongers of two centuries ago. To many diaries kept by men in public life the famous lines on Greville are still applicable:

For fifty years he listened at the door,
He heard some secrets and invented more.

There is hardly a form of the old types of historical writing that cannot find its counterpart in what passes for historical literature to-day, but happily the old credulity, the old verbosity, the old obliquity of vision are no longer able to pass current as good coin of the realm, and more and more the reading public is coming to realize that all these historical concoctions are as injurious to the mind that absorbs them and believes in them as were injurious to the human body the old-time frauds and adulterations with which the apothecaries of the past filled the stomachs of their patients.

I would not for a moment seem to exaggerate the archaic character of much that has served for history in the past or fail in appreciation of any form of historical writing to-day that meets the end for which it is designed. Much of the older work was written with charm, beauty, vivacity, zeal, courage, and religious conviction, and even before the middle of the nineteenth century, history as a subject for serious study had advanced in Germany, France, and England beyond the levels of the literary hacks, such as Rollin, Goldsmith, and Smollett, to the higher standards of Hume and Robertson and again to the writings—magnificent for their day—of Niebuhr and Ranke in Germany, the Thierry's, Guizot, and Mignet in France, and Hallam and Macaulay in England. With the nineteenth century came signs of the beginning of wisdom—doubt, skepticism, and discipline; and the appreciation of the fact that long training in the experimental method was needed if history were to have a scholarly value. A few began to emancipate themselves from dogmas and theories, but only here and there one, such as Ranke, the greatest of them all, attempted to deal with history for

its own sake or would have acknowledged that such a purpose was worthy of consideration. The best of the writers of the period studied their sources systematically, as far as they could get hold of them, exhibited a high regard for criticism, and, by treating historical phenomena without reference to current controversies and without sentimentality, laid the foundations of the modern school.

To all the older writers, despite their limitations, the historian of to-day owes a debt that can never be paid, for they first explored the land. They were the great pioneers; they discovered a new world and made it a place of life and action and reality; and they aroused a new curiosity and a new zeal. They made substantial contributions to scholarship, and where they distinguished between legend and history, speculation and fact, they introduced a new art, that of doubting and believing rightly. In the hands of many of them experimental methods became more exact, the scope and depth of investigation were widened, and the foundations were laid not only of knowledge but also of an interest in the past of mankind that was richer than ever before. The early nineteenth century is the period when the modern historical spirit and the modern historical method were born.

American historical scholarship owes its regeneration largely to the influence and teaching of these men. It was an event of no little importance for the future of historical research and writing in this country when in 1853 two young graduates of Yale College went to Europe, ostensibly as attachés to the American embassy at St. Petersburg, but actually to study and investigate social and educational methods abroad. They were Daniel C. Gilman, afterwards the first president of the Johns Hopkins University, and Andrew D. White, first of Michigan and later of Cornell. Brilliant forerunners and self-trained historians—such as Sparks, Bancroft, Palfrey, Hildreth, Motley, Arnold, and Parkman, among whom Bancroft and Motley had had German experience—were already working in isolation, individual luminaries of an epic historical age in America. For some years local interests had been subserved by the founding of local historical societies and by the beginnings made of gathering materials for the writing of our history. But as far as the national period was concerned, the results were relatively speaking meagre and the workers few. The historical science of this period was but a faint adumbration of the historical science that was to come. For three years White studied at both Paris and Berlin and returned to America determined to put into practice the lessons he had learned. Starting at the University of Michigan in 1857, he in-

augured the first courses in history that were ever given in this country representative of the modern idea. Of his work, his successor at Michigan, Charles Kendall Adams, himself a German-trained scholar and one imbued with the same ambitions, wrote as follows:

The inestimable service of Professor White, during his five years at Michigan, was the fact that at that early day, years before a similar impulse had been felt anywhere else in the country, the study of history was lifted to the very summit of prominence and influence among the studies of the college course. No one who was not on the spot can adequately realize the glow of enthusiasm with which this reaction was welcomed by the students of the university.

But White introduced no seminary and officially trained no students. That was left for Charles Kendall Adams himself to do in 1869 and for Henry Adams at Harvard in 1871. Of the latter, one of his students, Professor Laughlin, has recently written, "He came as the paladin of new adventure. He had the dash and spirit of the iconoclast. He tied up American history, not only with British institutions but also with those of our Teutonic forebears". From these seminaries issued the first dissertations printed in this country. The number was small but the quality of the work was high. As yet the seminary as a training-ground for students was only in its infancy. Adams at Harvard soon tired of his effort and turned to other things; Adams at Michigan continued his enterprise until 1885, but the want of any means of publication limited seriously the influence of his example. Neither of these experiments begot other experiments or fathered a school of investigators.

In the meantime new influences were at work and the teachings of Darwin, Buckle, Draper, and Lecky began to simmer in the American historical mind. A broadening of the historical viewpoint took place with the sifting into America of the writings of Kemble, Green, Laboulaye, Maine, Freeman, and their followers. The decades of the 'seventies and 'eighties were a time of controversy and debate, of violent recoil and no less violent enthusiasm. The older school vehemently opposed the determinism of Buckle and the biological, evolutionary writings of Darwin and Wallace; while the younger generation, less committed than were their elders to the rigid limitations of the old theology, welcomed any breaking away from the traditions of the past. They took up with all the zeal of converts the Germanic ideas of Green and Freeman, and saw in the whole complex of origins, survivals, folk-motes, marks, and other insignia of Anglo-Saxon freedom an inspiring

enlargement of the historical horizon. The idea of unity and continuity, applicable to the history of their own country as well as to that of the old world, sank deep into their minds. During these years many vagaries held sway, the imagination took wild flights into the primitive past, and processes of historical purification had to be set up and a certain amount of discipline enforced before the balance between romanticism and classicism could be restored.

The spirit of free inquiry, zeal for knowledge, and the absorbing interest which obtained in matters of politics and the state, characteristic of German instruction in the seventies and eighties of the last century, had a tremendous influence upon the group of young men who went there from America and listened to lectures on constitutional history, constitutional law, and political science. Narrative and description, chronicles and annals, representative types of historical writing of that day, became decreasingly important, while more significant became such subjects as institutions and constitutions, legal and social organization, economic theory and public law, administration and government. For a time it looked as if history as a subject for serious study might be driven from the field. Clio stood aghast, seemingly stripped of her attributes, as one by one government, administration, economics, law, sociology, and finance were torn from her grasp and she saw herself classed as a mere remnant, a residuum, an inferior entity, calling for inferior qualities of mind and wanting in those characteristics of exact delimitation which the advanced student demanded and the political scientist had in mind. But soon she took stock of her virtues and endowments, and realizing how imperfectly she had been defended by those who had been her guardians in the past, rose to a fuller appreciation of her own importance and her real greatness and demanded recognition, not as a remainder or residuum, but as the one universal interest embracing all the rest. In the end the remnant proved to be a seamless garment that could neither be parted nor rent. To use Mr. Teggart's phrase, history proved to be not the scullion in the kitchen of political science, but the mistress of the whole house. The conflict was glorious, and history emerged bearing the spoils of war. The effects were beneficial and fruitful for both sides of the controversy.

These years from 1880 to 1900 were a time of great awakening in the American historical world, as effective in its way as was the corresponding awakening already taking place in the field of the natural sciences. It was a time of exhilaration and almost religious fervor among the younger scholars, who saw new spheres of oppor-

tunity opening before them and entered on the quest with the zeal of explorers making new discoveries or of crusaders advancing to new conquests. The student of to-day, who is born into an historical world already mature, finds it hard to realize that after the Civil War the teaching of history in our schools and colleges was either non-existent or of so dull and juiceless a character as to deserve neither mention nor respect, that historical investigation had largely ceased to be active, and that writing on American history in the interest of the public at large had sunk to a low level of prosiness and insularity. This condition it was that gave John Fiske his great opportunity and prepared the way for the enthusiastic reception which his works received from the readers of that day. Fiske found historical writing in a state of dullness that had become almost a byword. He came to the subject fresh and untrammelled by tradition and precedent and applied to it the powers not only of a versatile and vigorous mind but also of one already accustomed to view human development in terms of the cosmic universe. He captivated his readers by making American history interesting and significant. He vitalized it, bringing it out of its isolation into touch with the forces of world history. He was almost the first to give life and reality to the men and events of our past and accomplished a remarkable feat when he turned the American people from Prescott, Irving, Parkman, and Motley, and others, whose subjects lay chiefly outside the limits of the present United States, and caused them to read with enjoyment books that dealt with their own origin and growth. Nothing that Fiske wrote is great history, but much of it is good history, and his place in American historiography is one of great merit and dignity.

Of the new movement two aspects stand out in high relief. First, in colleges and universities an extraordinary reorganization began which in time took on the character of a veritable revolution. Old chairs were divided and new chairs were founded devoted to history alone. Courses in history were increased where they existed and started where they did not exist, and the proper methods of teaching the subject to undergraduates became a burning question and has remained such ever since. The demand for teachers specially prepared for the purpose of historical instruction increased vastly and men who had been trained in Germany and France came back to direct and guide the new activity. The second aspect was more important than the first. Teachers and investigators for the first time were trained in America. In 1876 was opened the Johns Hopkins University, which under the inspiration

of its first president, Gilman, became the first academic institution in America to devote itself primarily to graduate instruction and study. The seminary, which was introduced at once, took root under the late Herbert B. Adams, and has been amazingly fruitful from that time to this. Almost simultaneously with the coming of Adams from Heidelberg, came John W. Burgess from Leipzig, Berlin, and Göttingen to teach at Columbia, where in 1880 was founded the School of Political Science, largely for the purpose of advanced instruction and research. The influence of these two centres of historical activity and life can hardly be overestimated. They mark a new epoch in the history of our subject and became the starting-points in the leavening process which in forty years was to spread into every part of the educational life of America. After 1890, fewer and fewer historical students found it necessary to go abroad, for they were able to secure adequate training at home.

That the fruits of his seminary efforts should not be lost and that the stimulus of print should be applied to the students under his charge, Adams started the *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science*, the first series of its kind to be instituted in this country; and a few years later, in 1886 and 1891, the Columbia school established the *Political Science Quarterly* and the *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*. Each of these was the forerunner of many similar publications of the present day. A knowledge of historical literature on a large scale was brought to the student, the general reader, and the collector of books by Adams's *Manual*, first issued in 1882 and in revised form in 1889, and so helpful has this contribution proved to be that it is now to be brought up to date and so thoroughly revised as to constitute, strictly speaking, an independent work. Organized effort and publication were stimulated by the founding of our own American Historical Association in 1884 and by the issue of its yearly reports and supplemental volumes, now constituting some sixty altogether, for the promotion of historical studies, the collection and preservation of historical manuscripts, and kindred purposes in the interest of American history and of history in America. In 1886 bibliography and method received a new impetus with the publication of the first volume of Winsor's *Narrative and Critical History of America*, eventually completed in eight volumes of bibliographical and cartographical matter, which organized the literature and sources of American history in print and manuscript. In 1889 appeared Bernheim's treatise on historical method, the first book to

bring to the student in America any knowledge of the proper technique of his subject and destined to be the forerunner of many other works of the same kind, which broadened the range of treatment and adapted technique to the needs of transatlantic students. In 1895 was established the *American Historical Review*, at first conducted as an independent publication and finally taken over by the Association as owner and director. For nearly thirty years, during all but four of which it has been in charge of a single managing editor, it has done more than any other single agency to establish sound historical principles and uphold consistent historical ideals. In the same year the Association inaugurated a more progressive policy, enlarging its functions and widening its appeal by taking on new activities and becoming an itinerant body.

The result of all these activities was a true renaissance, in which the conception and treatment of history, under the inspiring leadership of men who saw visions and dreamed dreams, rose above the level of mere schoolmastering and became creative. This was the springtime of the historical movement in America. Invaluable as had been the influence of Germany and France upon the movement at its inception, our scholars soon created their own historical atmosphere and laid down their own rules for their seminaries and schools of research. The German tendency toward undue specialization and the narrowing of the range of study was counteracted in America by the native instinct for practical endeavor, and especially by the demands which our educational institutions were making for men trained to teach in any field that might be required by the college curriculum. From the beginning the policy governing both the Association and the *Review* was opposed to excessive concentration of interest and was encouraging to those who, convinced that no good could come of splitting the subject into fragments, believed that the true function of historical study was not argumentative and exclusive but rather synthetic and constructive. The habit of talking about political history and church history and economic history and military history and agricultural history and all the other varieties of history gradually gave place to the higher purpose of viewing all these subjects as parts of a common whole and refusing to allow fences of any kind. By the beginning of the twentieth century, history in the large creative sense had come to its own in America. It had asserted not only its right to exist but its own supremacy. It had organized its activities, gathered its army of adherents, demonstrated by voice and example the seriousness and importance of its aims, and proved its value as an asset in our civilization. In these

twenty years history entered upon a transformation as complete as any which had been effected in the exact sciences, in social organization, and in philosophical thought.

Not a little of the success which history has attained along these lines was due to the spirit of organization and co-operation that characterized the period. As we have seen, the older historians worked largely in isolation, a condition that is not only undesirable in itself but is to-day becoming more and more impossible. The modern worker has come to realize that in union there is strength and hope of success, and that from the earliest stage of the collecting and preserving of materials to the final presentation of conclusions, combination and mutual assistance are in every way essential. The fact that in our universities historical study is organized, historical needs are known, and historical standards are enforced has brought it about that the historical output to-day is largely controlled by our collegiate departments. The material is too vast, the scope both in space and in time too broad, the problems are too varied and the demands made on the scholar in matters of thoroughness and accuracy too exacting for the isolated, untrained, and unprofessional scholar to compete with success. There are, of course, magnificent exceptions to this rule, particularly in England, where research in the past has been less highly organized than in this country and where some of the great masterpieces of historical writing have appeared from the pens of men of genius working more or less individually. But the fact that we are passing through a period in which monographic writing is a dominant feature renders co-operation all the more important. The monograph in history corresponds to the experiment in the laboratory, where the investigator is at all times in touch with the problems and workers in the field and is able to make his results known to his brother scientists through the medium of the scientific publications. The historical student can do the same, and either in notes, articles, monographs, or books can make his results known to the world. Our *Review* prints articles on other subjects than those relating to this country and in time foreign reviews may be brought to appreciate the desirability of publishing articles about America.

The truth is that in the past our historians rather than our history have interested the foreigner, and our co-operation with the old world, as Professor Haskins has so admirably shown, has been more active than that of the old world with us. Through the medium of the American Historical Association and the *American Historical Review*, local and sectional historical interests are gradually being

drawn into a common whole, and a very promising beginning is now being made of Anglo-American co-operation in the conferences of professors of history from the two countries and in the effort made to expound the part that Great Britain has played in the events of our colonial period and the connection which her history has had with our national affairs. Gradually a measure of international co-operation will be obtained, as our history, rightly understood, is seen to be essential to a knowledge of world history, and the scholars of the European continent will come to appreciate the significant share that America has had and is to have in the promoting of modern civilization. Some day we may see this appreciation expressed in the founding of chairs of American history in foreign universities and in the writing of books by foreigners on American history—books that will be of interest not only to the people for whom they are written, but also to us, in so far as they enable us to see ourselves as others see us. The growing importance of America in the affairs of the world is bound to lead to a quickening of interest on the part of outsiders in the character and details of her history; and it may easily happen that these mutual efforts to overcome the isolation of America in things historical may well be the forerunner of the greater effort that will be needed to overcome her isolation in things political.

A subject which in forty years has passed from a state of incoherence and disorder to one of organization and order; which has attracted to itself thousands in our colleges and hundreds in our graduate schools; which has won for itself a place of equality with all other subjects in the curricula of our institutions of learning; which is promoted by a learned and influential review devoted solely to its interests; and which is supported by a network of local and sectional societies, culminating in this great association of more than twenty-five hundred members—a subject, that is, which has attained to maturity and professional standing in the world of scholarship and science must of necessity display certain marked characteristics of treatment and be governed by certain definite principles according to which its votaries perform their work. Historical methods cannot be merely haphazard or empirical, nor can historical precepts be the result of accident or chance. The historian cannot be a free lance to write as he pleases, for he must play the game according to the accepted rules, and it is one of the outstanding marks of the progress which the study of history has made in this country that there are accepted criteria accompanying historical research and presenta-

tion and accepted standards—constituting a code not dreamed of in older days—to which the writer of history must conform.

But first of all, we must reckon with the fact that our views as to what constitutes history have become enlarged. No one will ever say again with Droysen and Maurenbrecher that the statesman is the historian in practice or that the historian's task is to make the state understand its origin, its duty, and the conditions of its life. No one to-day can agree with Seeley that history is the biography of states or with Freeman that history is past politics and politics present history. These pronunciamientos have passed into the limbo of things unheeded. History is not limited to politics, diplomacy, or war, but is concerned with man's every activity, and while writers will always differ in their estimates and stresses, it is doubtful if ever again precedence will be given to the forms of government and the rise and fall of political parties. The historian claims the right to concern himself with any subject needed to explain the situation that he has set himself to understand and expound. He realizes, as never before, that no event or aspect or quality of the past can be understood without seeing it in connection with the entire life of the times. He may need to know something about religious creeds, socialistic theories, systems of land distribution and agronomy, the working of the common law, the influence of money and banking and international exchange, the literature, art, architecture, and philosophy of an age, and even of the laws of nature in the fields of physics, chemistry, biology, and psychology—indeed the whole historical complex in peace and war. Any part of the whole record of civilization is the legitimate object of his quest.

The first step in the historical process is research, and within this field a remarkable change has taken place as to the nature of the material now utilized by the historian and the tools of trade constantly being prepared for his use. Both the raw material and the instruments for working it up into a finished product are such as the older historians knew nothing about. As regards the material, the older generation depended largely on the chronicle, the memoir, the diary, the letter, and other forms of conscious source-evidence. Even Freeman limited himself to the medieval chronicle in prose and verse, eschewed manuscripts and palaeography, and paid no attention to the vast quantities of records and documents that had accumulated in local and governmental archives. The modern scholar considers as grist to his mill anything whatever that represents man's activities on earth—charters, rolls, acts, accounts, extents, registers, log-books, and the thousand and one varieties of

texts that have come into existence in ever increasing quantities as the years have passed, all representative of man's life as a social and political being. The material thus made available is increasing year by year until its bulk is outstripping the power of the student to inspect and digest it. Hence the necessity of lists and indexes and guides and repertories and other forms of the modern historical mechanism. To the scholar every document has some importance, and how to find it and to determine its relative value is an important part of the student's training. The formal document is losing some of its prestige in the presence of the accumulating mass of humbler materials that show, often more truly and accurately, the actual influences at work in contemporary thought and life. The official document may often be misleading, because an "inspired" statement, and the same language used at different periods of history may have different meanings in the minds of those who wrote the words. All this material is dealt with critically as regards its text and with scrutiny as regards its origins and the reasons for its existence. To wide and careful research is added the test of criticism in every field of inquiry from the Book of Acts and the History of Eginhard to the Diary of John Adams and the reports of the battle of Jutland. Not only has "conscious" material to be stripped of its errors and prejudices, but even "unconscious" and official sources need to be interpreted and properly understood.

In discussing the next step of the historical process, namely, interpretation or exposition, we are on more debatable ground and must take account of significant changes in the historian's attitude toward his subject. It has been well said that the "main feature of recent research is the displacement of the picturesque by the study of conditions and ideas". No one would dare assert to-day that the main end of historical study is description, narrative, or even biography, and the modern historian always questions the value of history written in biographical form. The Victorians, both in England and America, were hero-worshippers unashamed. Great men dominated their scene and the incense and reverence of the temple permeated the historical writing of their day. Mazzini criticized Carlyle, who exalted the dramatic and heroic aspects of his subject, for not conceiving of humanity apart from the individual, and for not recognizing in people any collective life or collective aim. With the utmost truth he asserted that in the study of individuals there can be "no intelligible chain of connection between cause and effect, no constructive accomplishment in understanding and laying bare the complex processes that have built up the life

of humanity". History to-day is dealing less and less with personalities and actions in isolation and more and more with the development and interrelation of ideas and institutions, with the origin, growth, and modification of human thought and human relationships, and with the influence of material conditions of life on social and political organization.

The modern historian realizes, too, that with the passing of excessive emphasis on the personal element will disappear also the exaggerated notion of personal liberty in human history. He accepts Huxley's statement that men must renounce some of their freedom of action as a necessary condition of social existence, and that there is no nation or country, present or past, in which adult man has had or now has exclusive possession of himself. He believes further that the continuance of society always depends on the tacit admission by every member of it that the polity of which he forms a part has a claim to act in some measure as his master. He knows that the individual in every age is surrounded and dominated by the conditions about him, and that no man can be taken out of his setting and construed as an independent agent. He knows that no one at any time is entirely out of touch with the intellectual, moral, and social tendencies of his time, even though he may be a little ahead of them or a little behind them. He knows that in all ages conservatives and liberals are necessary parts of every social and political community, that ultra-conservatives and ultra-radicals are a menace to social peace, and that historically and generally speaking the enthroned immobility of stupid reactionaries leads to revolt or revolution, just as enthroned and uncontrolled radicalism is likely to be followed by reaction. Personalities are enormously interesting and important in themselves, but their relation to the collective mind is more significant than their individual actions. For instance, the common will for peace in the world at the present moment is a weightier historical factor than the policies of individual statesmen or the talk of war. Maitland says, "What men have thought—that is history", and the historian is less concerned with what individual men are thinking and doing than with what groups of men are thinking and doing; for in the growing convictions of the majority lies the future of the world.

Also, just as the historian of to-day is making new demands upon the subject-matter of history, so is the subject-matter itself making new demands upon the historian. He must attain to a state of more or less complete absorption in the life of the age to which he is giving his attention, and be so far at home with the spirit and

thought of a people as intuitively to avoid anachronisms and misreadings of the data at his disposal. He must free his mind of those modern prepossessions and ideas that twist and contort the judgment, and must not construe men and institutions of earlier periods in terms and language of the present. He must not inject motives and methods that are foreign to the thought and habits of a particular time and country and must always be on his guard against ascribing to the men of the past that which has been achieved only in modern times. He must keep his mind open to both sides of a controversy and be able to understand the psychology of sections and nations, if he is to interpret truly both motivation and conduct. The idealist or doctrinaire in history is in constant danger of treating peoples of different parties or countries as if they were thinking along the same lines, conforming to the same moral, ethical, and legal standards, and acting in accord with similar aspirations and desires. This menace is greatest in periods of revolution and war, when conflicting psychologies and the motor forces of heredity and environment are always among the causes which have led to open rupture, as in the case of Great Britain and her colonies in the days of our Revolution, of North and South in the days of our Civil War, and of Germany and the Allies before, during, and after the Great War.

Furthermore, he must not picture himself as a moralist or deem it any part of his task, as generally did the historians of the past, to provide his readers with ethical or moral judgments or to decide where lies the credit or blame for historical events. Goldwin Smith, particularly in his later years, was much given to historical moralizing, and history became to him a tale of corruption and superstition, jobbery, rapacity, and maladministration generally. There are others, too, who convert history into a frightful monument of sin; who excoriate feudalism, the medieval Church, the medieval monarchy, mercantilism, protection, and an established church, and consider historical study valuable only as far as it furnishes opportunities for moral instruction; who assign to each personage of the past his full quota of moral responsibility; and who take it upon themselves to instruct statesmen and governments of the past in what ought to have been their duty. The weakness of the moral judgment in history lies in its suppression of the time-test and in its application of modern and personal standards to the men of other ages than our own. It tends to disappear with the realization of the fact that the object of historical study is to interpret, not to condemn; to understand, not to preach or revile.

This brings us to the difficult question of objectivity in historical writing, that vice so abhorred of certain minds, which Treitschke called "anemic" and "bloodless" and one of our own writers has dubbed "the thrice blessed anchorage of the academic mind". A recent critic has likened objective writing in history to "a grim, worldly old hag", who would quench romance in Eden itself and never suffer the world to go hunting Golden Fleece or Helens of Troy or indulge in any of the midsummer madnesses of romantic adventure. I notice that a good deal of this sort of comment comes from those of strong literary leanings, who wish to inject into what they write a large element of personality, who, like Byron, prefer that the history they read should be colored by human prejudice and passion, and who have at their command a palette of bright colored words, epigrams, and vivacious expressions. Those who speak scornfully of things academic are as a rule not interested in history, but in literature. They wish all historical effort to be dominated by what is called "human interest", which is usually nothing else than dramatic action, and oppose objectivity because to them it connotes dullness, colorlessness, and impersonality. They believe that it is the deliberate object of the modern writer of history to efface himself as much as possible and leave to the reader the task of making what he can out of the material placed before him.

It is not necessary to deal either categorically or absolutely with a topic of this kind, for complete objectivity would be as undesirable as it would be impossible; and it is equally true that not a little so-called objective writing is rather a burden to the memory than an illumination to the soul. On the other hand much subjective writing as history is worthless. We have had quite enough of the Michelet, Carlyle, and Treitschke types of history. He who writes objectively can have as strong convictions as he who writes subjectively, and if such a one prefers to omit from his treatment the fire and passion of the subjectivist, he does so because he believes that nothing is lost to the substance of history by moderation and restraint. To-day, it is generally agreed that even though the writer gather and test his material in the most approved scientific manner—for science is after all but a method of acquiring knowledge—even though he clothe his results in the literary dress of the latest mode, alluring even to the humblest mind, yet if he have misjudged the meaning and significance of that which he is expounding, have shaped his evidence to prove a point, or have demeaned history to serve personal ends, his work is vitiated from the beginning. Treitschke, for example, revelled in subjectivity, and though he was

undoubtedly sincere in proclaiming the divine mission of the Hohenzollerns and the destiny of Germany as the successor of the moribund British Empire, even his profound conviction could not make his work true history. Objective history is merely nonpartizan history. To write objectively is merely to write with the detachment of the onlooker rather than with the prejudice of the advocate and to draw conclusions from the evidence itself and not from prepossessions already existing in the writer's mind. History viewed through Whig or Tory spectacles, written as an aid to patriotic propaganda, given a utilitarian trend by the politician or the essayist, turned out by one amorous of words as an expression of "how I like it", and used to defend a doctrine, a theory, or a philosophy—all such history is a bad guide for the public because it does not tell the truth and an offense because it abuses a sacred trust. Objectivity is merely the historian's insistence that history must be true and that the truth of history should be the only end sought. This principle, obvious as it seems to-day, may be said to have received general acceptance only during these last thirty or forty years.

And now a word about the much discussed question of the style or styles of historical writing. With it we open a veritable Pandora box of troubles and have a number of aphorisms to deal with. Says one, "Unless a man writes vividly, he cannot write truthfully"; another, "History is not worth writing that is not worth reading"; or "The historian should know how to write as well as to read". The point of view indicated in these statements, as well as in other popular comments on the historian's work, shows a confusion of ideas as to the purpose of history. It seems to assume that the ultimate object of historical writing is entertainment, or, if that be deemed too hedonistic a word, then let us say to add to the joy of life and the elevation of mankind. On the other hand, the historian insists that, although these things are good in themselves, they are incidental to his main purpose, which is to study history for its own sake and not primarily for the sake of interesting or benefiting society. It is just here that he insists on being considered as a specialist, and will not grant that the lay reader or reviewer is competent to decide how history should or should not be written. Moreover, he knows that the readability of a history is no guaranty of its artistic or intrinsic worth, for the average man, as a rule, is no judge of art when he sees it, whether in drama, music, painting, or history, and has no standards wherewith to determine the value of a work not intentionally designed for his own particular enjoyment. There can be no doubt that the over-

stressing of the literary side of history and the demand that historical writing take on a form pleasing to the general reader has in many instances done great harm to the cause which the historian has at heart.

What then are the criteria by which historical writing should be judged? In the first place, the substance must be true, sufficiently abundant, and of such vital significance as to justify the creative effort that the writer has expended upon it. In the second place, the ideas emanating from this creative effort must grow, as it were, inevitably out of the material and be in accord with it, not imposed upon it through any subjective impulses of the writer derived from other sources or exploited for any subjective purpose, patriotic, political, or otherwise. Finally, these ideas must be clothed in language best suited to the content and to the audience for which they are designed. Only when the highest levels are attained and harmony secured in substance, interpretation, and presentation can we have great history and great art, the finest combination in the historical field. These tests applied to any historical writer, past or present, will, I think, help us to determine the place of that writer as a master of his craft. They will place Stubbs and Maitland far higher in the scale than Macaulay and Froude, Parkman higher than Bancroft, and Lea higher than Prescott or Motley. Also under this test all varieties of scholarly historical exposition, of whatsoever kind they may be, fall into their proper places, serving some useful end. The dissertation of the doctor of philosophy may reach high rank as a work of artistic proportions and, per contra, many a work that has caught the popular fancy may fail wholly when viewed from the standpoint of historical art.

There has been gradually coming into existence during these forty years a something that is hardly yet compact enough to be called an historical domain, hardly articulate enough to be called an historical school, but which we may designate, in the spirit of Stefansson's definition of the Arctic regions, an historical state of mind. This is the state of mind of the trained and expert scholar, call him a professional scholar if you will, or even a scientific scholar, who studies history for its own sake without regard to its character as literature, politics, poetry, or drama, or indeed anything else than history, and is convinced that there is a sufficient reason for such study to exist quite apart from any connection which it may have with the reading public. Within this sphere the historian deals with research and interpretation, that is, with the sources and the substance of history. Here he is laying the foundations of his

subject, polishing his spade that he may dig deeply below the surface, unravelling historical tangles, unriddling historical riddles, and out-sherlocking Holmes himself in doing the detective work of his craft. He is gathering new material, re-editing and re-reading old texts and old documents, working out old problems and discovering new ones, filling in the gaps of historical knowledge, pursuing his experiments just as does the investigator in the scientific laboratory. Within this sphere history is not a narrative to be written but a problem to be solved—a single great problem made up of thousands of lesser ones, and within this sphere scholars write for each other, and the dull history, the badly written history, the monographic treatise, and the much abused dissertation of the doctor of philosophy find a welcome and a permanent abiding-place. Here it is that the literary reviewer's remarks about objectivity, plodding scholarship, and the dry-as-dust treatment by the college professor pass unnoticed, that the story-teller's gift is rated as but a minor asset, and that the ability of the writer to dress up the facts of history in the colorful garments of romance is of but secondary consideration. And, most important of all, here it is that the only real progress has been made and is now being made in the field of history in America to-day. The modern historian believes that it is the creative thinker in any field, whether large or small, who rises to the highest levels of his craft, and that synthesis, the interpretation of the evidence, and the determining of what history is all about are the touchstones of mastery and genius, by which ultimately the historian's work will be judged.

The older historians got nowhere in their attempts to deal with the synthetic side of history, and even those who gave it a philosophical interpretation—such as Hegel and Condorcet, for example—lived and thought in a realm of unreality. So unsuccessful have been the philosophers in their handling of the subject that the historical scholar of to-day is very much in doubt as to whether or not there is such a thing as a philosophy of history, for all interpretations couched in terms of philosophy are proving vague and unsubstantial. Other writers have construed history as a progressive advance toward spiritual and intellectual freedom, a constant process of evolution from lower to higher forms, or a socio-psychological development of society from simplicity to complexity. Others still have given it a religious form, as a record of the dealings of God with man, or a demoniac trend, as if the world were steadily growing worse. A majority of those who deal in synthetic interpretations make frequent use of the terms "progress", "development", and

the "curve of social evolution", as if it were proved beyond peradventure that humanity was moving steadily forward to a more perfect organization and the attainment of higher ideals. Such writers apparently start with the premise that historical processes are necessarily for the better and connote a continuous improvement as man's intelligence grows and his knowledge increases. But convenient as are the words "progress", "development", and "evolution", to express something that has taken place and is undoubtedly taking place in the history of mankind, they are loose terms, incapable of exact definition or proof, and serve only to symbolize conditions not clearly understood and regarding which there is no general accord. There are those who go so far as to say that the modern movement of rationalism and experiment which began with Bacon has been as fatal in morals and politics as it has been successful in science; that the growth of materialism has far outdistanced the mental and spiritual development of the race; and that the human factor has in some measure been swallowed up by the machine. All would probably agree that the spirit of philanthropy and the desire to be of service to one's fellow-men have made enormous strides in the last fifty years; that decency in language and manners, in sobriety, and in certain forms of morality is vastly more prevalent than in the past; that the rousing of the public conscience is one of the greatest of modern achievements; and that, though evils are as prevalent as ever, our consciousness of them and our determination to get rid of them are a promise of better things. But even these do not predicate absolute progress, for, as the biologist and the psychologist would say, we progress not because we have knowledge, but because we have the intelligence, the ability, and the willingness to apply our knowledge. We are, in this country, enmeshed in a network of legislation and legal restraint, and it is a pertinent question to ask whether as a whole, in self-discipline and self-control, we are the equal of our forefathers. Change and impermanence, which are history's most characteristic features, do not necessarily imply that the world is getting better in such vital and somewhat intangible traits as self-mastery, self-denial, social responsibility, and regard for the generations yet unborn. The curve of social evolution is a broken line that sometimes rises and sometimes falls and sometimes retrogrades altogether. No one can question that the world is in a process of constant change, but as to the nature of that change in its varied aspects the widest differences of opinion will always exist.

There is no opportunity here to discuss this greatest and most important of all historical questions. It has not become, to any great extent, a subject of discussion or controversy, largely because of its speculative character and its remoteness from the practical, every-day side of life and study. The article by Mr. Teggart, printed in 1910, entitled "The Circumstance and Substance of History", and the presidential address by Professor Cheyney last year, in which he sums up along supplemental lines the forces or "laws", as he calls them, that have been working within the human race during the course of its existence, are representative of present-day thought on this subject and indicate the position reached in the effort to think along these lines. They show the change that has come over the interpretation of history in these forty years, for such articles as these could hardly have been conceived, much less written, before the new historical movement in America began.

A brief summary of these opinions would run somewhat as follows. Human history is made up of a constant series of adjustments on the part of man to meet continuous and recurring changes in the conditions that surround him and in the thoughts that impel him to action. These adjustments, their antecedents and consequences, are history. No adjustment is perfect or permanent, although there have always been those who considered it so, and these, the conservatives and ultra-conservatives in history, are among the most difficult factors to be reckoned with by the historian. In the process of adjustment environment was at first a leading influence, but became less significant as knowledge spread and control over the forces of nature became more complete. Personality, too, and the importance of the individual grew less as intelligence broadened out more and more among the masses of the population and the collective man overshadowed the individual as a factor in these adjustment processes. Within the social group itself, man has had to adapt himself to the demands of his own growth; his inquisitiveness has known no end, his desires and needs have never been satisfied and never will be, and the problems he creates in his effort to solve those that already exist become in turn the cause of new adjustments. Most of these adjustments are due not to conscious but to unconscious effort on his part, for he rarely realizes that he is in process of accommodating himself to new conditions. They represent the operation of intellectual, social, economic, genetical, and psychological forces, in living matter no less than in living minds, that are always at work, sometimes silently, sometimes openly, and sometimes with great force and explosive power.

Refusal to recognize these laws of impermanence or to see the need of readjustment to new conditions has led to the cataclysms of history—resistance, revolt, and revolution—and to the eventual disappearance of the more conservative elements of society. History shows us the constant waning of the old and the waxing of the new, and the task of the historian is to discover the character of these processes and the nature of the laws and forces at work bringing them about, to come to some agreement as to the extent to which the individual is capable of guiding and directing these forces, and to determine the measure of human freedom involved. These processes vary with the time, section, and country involved, but they are as ceaseless as the tides. A study of them enables the historian to infer, in some particulars at least and as through a glass darkly, the relation of these adjustments and laws to human conduct in the future, and to predicate in a large and general way the trend of history and the tendencies that are to govern the future movements of human society. He can do no more, for he is neither prophet nor poet, since the free will of the individual is a factor that can never be reduced to the control of historical law. Such is the general viewpoint of the modern historical thinker and writer.

During these forty years historical enterprise in America has been passing through a formative and pioneer stage. It has been hewing its way through the wilderness, clearing the ground, laying anew the foundations, utilizing to the full the contributions of the older workers who have furnished material of fine quality and character, and rebuilding the structure from the beginning. It has been testing the strength and reliability of the substance, applying sounder and saner principles of plan and construction, and arriving at less ornate forms of presentation, confident that there should always be a greater *rapprochement* between style and content, and that the historical engineer and the historical architect should work in the closest harmony with the object for which the structure is designed.

What of the next forty years? Will they show equally important advances along the same and other lines? Will our homeless documents in Washington, as well as our homeless diplomats abroad, eventually find permanent and secure abiding-places? Will our national government ever rise to a sense of its obligations, by falling into step with the other civilized nations of the world and doing its share to aid in the publication of the historical material at its disposal? Will the trustees of our universities ever discover that research and publication in history and allied subjects have some claim on their attention and a right to receive some part of the in-

come at their disposal? Will men of wealth, donors and benefactors, ever appreciate the fact that gifts in the interest of the history of their country are as important as gifts in the interest of science and medicine? And will the public ever reach that high level of sympathetic understanding which will enable it to recognize the value of historical scholarship as it now recognizes the value of scientific research? There is still much to be done and many to be taught. I can but hope that in another forty years this Association will see historical research and publication as highly organized, as richly endowed, and as productive of works showing constructive and creative thought as is certain to be the case in the exact sciences. The progress which has been made in the past forty years is surely something of a guaranty of similar progress in the forty years to come.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

THE CONVERSION OF THE BRITISH TRADE-UNIONS TO POLITICAL ACTION

EXACTLY a century has elapsed since trade-unions were legalized in Great Britain. In that time they have developed strength and prestige until millions are enrolled in their ranks. To-day they are the backbone of a rising party which has been entrusted with His Majesty's Government. Yet for half that hundred years their legal position was precarious, their members were almost to a man voteless, and there was not a single representative of their own class to express their views at Westminster. The most striking improvement in their fortunes followed close upon the Reform Bill of 1867, which conferred the franchise upon the town laborer—a signal victory won only after a long campaign.

During earlier movements for parliamentary reform, organized labor maintained as a rule a position aloof from politics. In 1832 the most important labor society, the National Union of the Working Classes, regarded the Great Bill as a delusion so far as workingmen were concerned, and not worth a contest. The next association of any consequence, the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union, during its brief career fell under the influence of Robert Owen, who, always contemptuous of political action, proposed to ignore the suffrage issue entirely, go straight to the root of the problem as he conceived it, and bring about a peaceful social revolution by economic means. In the late 'thirties arose the Chartist movement. Many trade-unionists were interested, but their organizations, with a few exceptions, seem to have stood aside. Try as they would, the Chartist leaders were unable to enlist their support or tap their funds. Upon the collapse of the Chartist cause the trades became definitely anti-political. "No politics" became the cry, and rules to that effect were inserted in their by-laws. Trade matters should be carefully separated from politics, it was said; politics would serve only to dissipate their resources and engender internal dissension. Meanwhile, they devoted their energies to reorganization, to building up their membership, and to securing better conditions of labor. A period of growth and prosperity followed, and by 1865 there were about one hundred and twenty-five thousand in their ranks.

The decade of the 'sixties opened in a manner most unpromising to political reformers. It was the reign of Palmerston and their

cause seemed dead. The general prosperity told against them. It seemed as though the hoped-for results of the People's Charter would be secured without political action. It was at this juncture that John Bright suggested that established organizations of working-men, the rise of which was beginning to attract widespread attention, should be utilized by the political reformers.¹ The plan seemed practicable, for in the great cities the strikes of 1859 had produced trades councils, which were representative of the local unions and could secure united action from the constituent societies. Much prejudice, however, would have to be overcome before they could be forged into an effective political weapon.

By 1861 George Odger and George Howell, leaders in the London Trades Council, were ready to make the trial. Urged on the one hand by the Glasgow Trades Council and on the other by such Liberals as Professor E. S. Beesly,² they strove to enlist the trades in a movement for reform. Odger broached the subject at a meeting of delegates on January 9, 1862, but the trades disapproved.³ In the following October the Silver Cup Society of Carpenters, very probably at the instigation of Odger, pressed the London Trades Council to act, pointing out the peculiar advantages of such a body for leading an agitation.⁴ The reply of the Council stated that the members individually sympathized with the sentiment but thought the movement outside their province; however, it announced a meeting of trade-unionists to be held at a Bloomsbury public house—the usual political rendezvous in those days—on October 28, when a plan would be submitted whereby they could combine for such an agitation.⁵ This gathering proved to be the first of a series out of which evolved the Trades Unionists' Manhood Suffrage and Vote by Ballot Association, a name precisely expressive of its object. Membership was limited to unionists, who paid a penny a week for a card. It was hoped that such an organization would enable individuals to participate and at the same time to respect the tradition that the societies as such must abstain from politics. An address written by George Howell was issued to the trade-unionists of the United Kingdom. It was made very cautious in tone in order to dissipate the fears of the timid that politics would shelve social re-

¹ *Quarterly Review*, CXIX. 545-546.

² Minute Book of the London Trades Council, Oct. 30, Dec. 17, 1861.

³ *Ibid.*, Jan. 9, Feb. 17, 1862.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Oct. 21, 1862; *Beehive*, Oct. 25, 1862.

⁵ Minute Book of the London Trades Council, Second Yearly Report; *Beehive*, Oct. 25, 1862.

form; that the lessons of Chartism were not forgotten was shown by specific declarations against class-war doctrines coupled with advice to co-operate with other associations, to exert moral force only, and to prepare petitions "well authenticated in their signatures".⁶ After a few months of activity, however, the organization quietly dropped out of sight. The failure made way for another body, founded in December, 1863, by the same men and some middle-class Liberals, the Universal League for the Material Elevation of the Industrious Classes, the objects of which were stated to be the improvement of conditions of labor, education and means of recreation for the masses, and a general extension of the franchise.⁷ That Odger and Howell should consent to see the suffrage question relegated to last place in a general scheme of social reform proves how feeble must have been the response to the move of but a year before. The leading working-men had manifested a willingness to react to the overtures of the middle-class Liberals, but the trade-unions officially were still unmoved.

Soon afterwards the cause of reform received a significant accession. At this time Gladstone was completing his evolution toward liberalism—a result of his interest in Italian unity, the better showing made by the forces of democracy during the later phases of the American Civil War, and his own closer contact with the working-classes. His conversion was hastened early in 1864 by a deputation from the London Trades Council, whose spokesman, George Odger, pointed out the injustice suffered by the working-class in being excluded from the franchise and at the same time impressed him with their fitness for it.⁸ The Chancellor of the Exchequer acquiesced in all that was said and promised to take an early opportunity to state his views before Parliament. These words passed almost unnoticed, but it was a red-letter day in the history of reform when on May 11 he electrified the House with the boldest pronouncement yet made on the subject by a responsible minister—"Every man who is not presumably incapacitated by some consideration of personal unfitness or of political danger is morally entitled to come within the pale of the constitution".⁹ A qualifying statement about sudden or violent change went unheeded: the words were out and could not be recalled. The Trades Council could feel quite content with having won a possible champion for the movement.

⁶ Reform League Letter-Book, 1867, p. 958; *Beehive*, Nov. 22, 1862.

⁷ *Beehive*, Dec. 19, 1863.

⁸ *Ibid.*, May 14, Sept. 17, 1864.

⁹ Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, third ser., CLXXV. 324.

Working-class leaders reacted quickly to the stimulus. They hailed it as a political manifesto and looked for results as far-reaching as followed the conversion of Sir Robert Peel to free trade.¹⁰ The effect upon the anemic political organizations was instantaneous. The Universal League took on a new lease of life and the Trades Unionists Manhood Suffrage Association came out of a trance that had lasted over a year.¹¹ During the summer and autumn the two labored so energetically to work up an agitation that the *Beehive* was able in almost every issue to report activity. Once more the London Trades Council was petitioned to assume the command but again without success,¹² and it proved to be quite impossible to stir the country deeply. The signs were, nevertheless, far more favorable than at the opening of the decade. A change, bearing promise for the future, was slowly but surely taking place in the attitude of urban labor, especially in that section which was organized.

At this time the working-class movement was coming under the influence of five men in London, who constituted an informal cabinet of the trades, which Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb have christened "the Junta". Their policy was a combination of extreme caution in trade matters with energetic action for political reform. Of this group the keenest politician was George Odger.¹³ Odger, the son of a Cornish miner, was born in 1813 at Roborough, Devon. Although denied an education by the poverty of his youth, he became a self-taught man, who knew his Shakespeare intimately, and showed his ability to master problems of state and society in such a way as to astonish Gladstone himself. He early became a shoemaker and finally settled in London, where he rose to prominence during the building trades' lockout of 1859. Then followed years of intense activity. He was a leading figure in the London Trades Council, the moving spirit of several political organizations, president of the First International, and all the time a working shoemaker. His impassioned oratory made him the most popular labor leader in the metropolis and immensely respected by the middle-class Liberals as well, for he could appear on the same platform with John Bright and not suffer by the comparison. He was a hard and rough fighter and no attack was more feared than his. His friend, Robert Applegarth, of the Amalgamated Carpenters, was a native of Hull, born

¹⁰ *Beehive*, May 14, 1864.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, May 21-28, 1864.

¹² *Miner and Workman's Advocate*, Oct. 22, 1864.

¹³ *Life and Labors of George Odger*, reprinted from *St. Crispin*, the boot and shoemakers' journal.

in 1833. He became a radical as the result of reading Chartist literature and of some years spent in the United States. He, too, gained prominence in the International. William Allan was a Scottish Ulsterman, responsible for the upbuilding of the great Society of Engineers. To the Junta he contributed what Odger lacked—method. Guile and Coulson were influential in their own unions, the Ironfounders and the London Bricklayers, but never became figures of national importance like the others. Among the followers of the Junta were a number of rising younger men, such as William Randal Cremer, a carpenter, and George Howell, a bricklayer.

The unity of mind and purpose among these working-class leaders offered a strong contrast to the endless bickerings of the Chartists. With one exception they were willing to subordinate self to the cause. The faction-maker was George Potter, a carpenter, who twenty years earlier would have been a physical force Chartist. Against the careful cautious programme of the Junta Potter urged a vigorous strike policy.¹⁴ He published the *Beehive*, an excellent weekly, through which he built up an opposition to the Junta. Much bitter feeling resulted, for the Junta were somewhat jealous of Potter—a justified jealousy, it may be said, for he was a trouble-maker and the only discordant note in the prevailing harmony of the 'sixties.

When these men set out to manoeuvre the labor movement, especially the trade-unions, into political action, there were potent factors making for ultimate success. Many members of their societies were disgusted with the results of "no politics". They began to believe that there was a definite connection between political power and social welfare and that by neglecting the former they had simply abdicated in favor of the wealthy or consuming classes, thereby facilitating the exploitation of the producers. Parliament was abandoned to the landed aristocracy, military men, lords of finance, captains of industry, and professional men,¹⁵ that is, to the employing class and their sympathizers. "No politics", it seemed clear, meant voluntary slavery, for they could never meet their employers on equal terms so long as the latter controlled the machinery of the state. A correspondent of a labor newspaper wrote:

That cry of "no politics" is proof of their [the working-men's] voluntary political slavery, from which results their social degradation.

¹⁴ Minutes of the London Trades Council, March, 1864.

¹⁵ *Miner and Workman's Advocate*, June 25, 1864, Feb. 4, 1865. For an analysis of the House of Commons of 1866 according to occupation see the *Fortnightly Review*, Apr. 1, 1866, p. 428.

What but political power gives the capitalist the social means and the social influence which enable him to throw out of employment and reduce to starvation a thousand workmen if they do not obey his orders, and which give him, too, the civil and military forces of the nation to coerce the men into subjection? And what but the want of political power dooms the workmen to that socially degraded state in which their dignity perishes and their independence with it? What but the want of political power condemns the wealth producer to that state of dependence for his daily bread and his daily labor on the whims and caprices of an individual who can doom him to starvation at any moment?¹⁶

Some feared for the very existence of the unions; others that they might be so crippled by hostile legislation as to become impotent. It was argued that, even if well-intentioned, a House of rich employers could never do justice to associations of their employees,¹⁷ while a capitalist Parliament in a hostile mood might handicap labor by declaring illegal the strike weapon, or might even abolish the unions altogether, in which event all that had been won since the repeal of the Combination Acts would be lost.¹⁸ Even as matters stood their legal position was none too secure, because of the obscurity of the common law of conspiracy. Trade-unionists might meet to discuss wages and hours of labor, but it was extremely dangerous to attempt to make any agreement effective. Hostile opinion contended that some acts, although lawful if done by individuals, were unlawful if done in combination, and there were traces of a doctrine that it was criminal for one man to oblige another to abstain from the exercise of his proper craft or employment. Amid such uncertainty strikes or the threat to strike might be construed as conspiracy, and even negotiation with employers was liable to be interpreted as intimidation. Moreover, judges might look upon unions as combinations in restraint of trade and illegal in the sense of being contrary to public policy. It followed that, if outside the law, their rules could not be enforced and their funds would be at the mercy of their treasurers, who might rob them with impunity.¹⁹

Perhaps the most humiliating grievance was the inequality of employer and employee before the law under the Master and Servant Act. Of all civil contracts, only that between master and servant was enforced by the rigors of the criminal law. If the former broke an agreement, the operative could sue for damages or, in cases

¹⁶ *Miner and Workman's Advocate*, Nov. 12, 1864.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Jan. 28, 1865. Hill [and others], *Questions for a Reformed Parliament* (London, 1867), pp. 63 ff.

¹⁸ *Miner and Workman's Advocate*, Oct. 22, 1864; *Beehive*, Dec. 10, 1864; *Commonwealth*, June 23, 1866.

¹⁹ Sir James Stephen, *A History of the Criminal Law of England* (London, 1883), III. 209-210.

concerning wages of less than ten pounds, summon him before a justice and recover that amount. In this the process was strictly civil, but if an operative broke his contract he was liable to prosecution for a criminal offense. The master could sue out a warrant for his apprehension under which he could be seized and brought before a justice, who was necessarily of the upper class and in the manufacturing districts usually an employer himself. The justice could hear the case in his own house unchecked by other magistrates or the public; the operative could not be a witness in his own defense—a privilege permitted to his employer—and upon conviction a sentence of three months' imprisonment could be imposed. Nor did a term in jail relieve him from the contract; the master might call upon him to fulfill it and in case of a refusal bring him again to trial.

Prosecutions under the act became increasingly numerous until there were over ten thousand annually. For years there were protests from labor.²⁰ When examined before a Parliamentary Committee George Odger said: "I think men who are cognizant of this law say at once, 'There is an inequality in it, and it is against us:' they say, 'Who made it? Not us: we had no hand in making it: it was made by those who employ us, and by those who govern us: that is evidence of their justice and right.'"²¹ No grievance was thrust forward more prominently than this in the reform agitation.

It was the opinion of labor leaders that reform of the franchise would end the necessity of resorting to violence as a means of settling industrial disputes. Odger was heartily cheered when he said that "if the working class had political enfranchisement, such a lockout as that [in the iron trades] now disgracing the country would not have occurred",²² while a correspondent of a trade organ, evidently a miner, looked forward to the time when the representatives of labor and capital could settle their problems peacefully in the House of Commons.²³

As might be expected there were social aspirations behind the popular movement. Reform did not cease to be a "knife and fork question" with the passing of Chartism. Odger voiced these desires when he said:

We have been asked what we shall gain by it [the vote] when we get it? Our answer is a plain one: the working man's daughter[s]

²⁰ *Operative*, July 19, Oct. 11, 1851; *Beehive*, May 9, 1863; *Miner*, June 6, 1863; *London Times*, Aug. 29, 1866; *Commonwealth*, Jan. 5, 1867.

²¹ Hill and others, p. 42.

²² *Miner and Workman's Advocate*, Mar. 18, 1864.

²³ *Ibid.*, Oct. 22, 1864.

shall not be driven into the close garret or unwholesome workshop, there to labor fourteen or sixteen hours a day, sometimes all night, for a poor and beggarly subsistence. They should go forth and see nature, they should have leisure hours to acquire those attributes which would help to make them intelligent and useful wives. Poor boys should receive a better education and not be thrust into mines before they were strong enough for the work. The poor agricultural laborer should not be compelled to work and maintain his family upon eight shillings a week, nor yet sent to gaol for taking a bit of old wood to kindle a fire to warm a sick wife. The machine . . . should become a blessing to mankind as it was intended, and not be used to drive families upon the world to live or starve as the case may be. A change in the law should not starve hundreds of ribbon weavers, nor cotton panics make the industrious workman a pauper or a dependent upon charity; these things and a great many more should be done away with. The working man with the vote would feel himself free and independent; self-reliance, that noble soul-animating quality, would fully develop itself to the benefit of the whole of the community.²⁴

So it was predicted that the vote in the hands of the working-man would lead future Parliaments to deal as readily with sanitation as the present did with poachers; it would mean the end of truck and tommy for the miners and of extortionate frame rent for the weavers; and it would mean gowns for their wives' backs and shoes for their children's feet. Hopes were high that prosperity would follow the franchise. It was predicted that within a single year, at less cost than for an ordinary strike, the prospects of the laboring population could be completely changed.²⁵

Such were the motives which stimulated the trades to action, and various arguments were advanced to support their stand. History was invoked to prove that no rash experiment was being proposed: they were merely asking the return of a former right of which they had been unjustly deprived. "It is only a retreat upon the wisdom of our ancestors", it was said, indicating the comparatively democratic suffrage existing before 1430 and the narrowing that began in that year.²⁶ Furthermore, natural rights were appealed to and the note of equality was heard.²⁷

The argument most emphasized was that of fitness. The artisans of the 'sixties were reading and thinking men. They claimed honor, integrity, high moral principle, and an ability to judge between right and wrong equally well with those above them in station. There was every reason to think that their votes would be

²⁴ *Workman's Advocate*, Dec. 16, 1865.

²⁵ *Miner and Workman's Advocate*, Oct. 15, 22, 1864; *Workman's Advocate*, Nov. 11, 1865; *Tailor*, Dec. 8, 1866.

²⁶ *Beehive*, Oct. 18, 1862; *Miner and Workman's Advocate*, Feb. 11, 1865.

²⁷ *Miner and Workman's Advocate*, June 25, 1864, Jan. 28, 1865.

as independent as those of the middle-class shopkeepers, if not more so. They could point to great material gains: the earners of many millions of pounds annually had a stake in the country and bore a heavy share of the taxes. Moreover, they had recently shown their sense of responsibility: the Lancashire operatives had borne their sufferings during the cotton famine incident to the American War with stoicism and without a hint of sedition. No danger, it was urged, could result from their admission within the pale of the constitution.²⁸

Now that the working-class was more receptive to politics it is not surprising that some advances should be made toward linking up this movement with that of the middle-class reformers, who had never entirely relaxed their efforts since the days of Francis Place and Joseph Hume. The idea was broached early in 1864, when Garibaldi was given an ovation by the London trades. When the government, disliking such manifestations, hurried him away, the Working Men's Committee, headed by Odger and Howell together with some of the City reformers, arranged a meeting of protest on Primrose Hill. It was dispersed by the police, and all the leaders could do was to adjourn to a public house to talk it over. There Howell suggested the formation of a National Reform League. The idea found favor with the others and thereafter was never allowed to drop, although for the time being their efforts were confined to a revival of the Trades Unionists Association.²⁹

Nothing more was done until February of 1865, when upon the initiative of T. Mason Jones, a prominent Liberal, some conversations took place between middle-class and artisan leaders upon the possibility of utilizing existing working-class organizations to further reform—the same device which John Bright had suggested as early as 1860.³⁰ Well-known Liberals, including Samuel Morley, T. B. Potter, and Edmond Beales, were willing to supply the necessary financial backing. Encouraged by the favorable response to the first negotiations, Jones and Beales requested George Potter, editor of the *Beehive*, to send out circulars to about three hundred representative working-men to attend a meeting on February 23 at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre.

The meeting was attended by almost all the metropolitan labor leaders, including the Junta and every other unionist whose name

²⁸ *Miner and Workman's Advocate*, July 2, 1864, Aug. 19, 1865; *Tailor*, Oct. 20, 1866; *Workman's Advocate*, Nov. 25, 1866; *Commonwealth*, May 5, 1866.

²⁹ Reform League Letter-Book, 1867, pp. 342, 959; *Times*, Apr. 22–26, 1864.

³⁰ *Quarterly Review*, April, 1866, pp. 545–546.

was well known in the 'sixties. There were present also deputations from several local reform associations and eight delegates from the newly formed International Working Men's Association—the First International. Beales and Jones were there to speak for the middle-class Liberals. Significantly, Robert Hartwell was called to the chair—the same man who more than a quarter of a century before had presided over the meeting at the Crown and Anchor that instituted the Chartist movement. It was enthusiastically agreed to make common cause with the Liberals in an effort to win manhood suffrage and the ballot. A motion was carried turning the meeting into the Reform League, and a Committee was appointed to consult with the middle-class men.

On March 11 the deputation met the latter and stated that they were not prepared to enter upon a campaign for anything less than their entire programme. John Bright answered for the middle classes. To the intense disappointment of the working-men he refused to accept their platform and upon grounds of expediency stood for household suffrage only. A. S. Ayrton, M.P., supported Bright. It was manifest that the Liberals were divided—only about half of those present being willing to co-operate upon a basis of manhood suffrage. On the sixteenth the deputation reported the outcome to another working-class meeting in St. Martin's Hall. Odger voiced the general regret at the attitude of their allies. Some vigorous attacks on Bright followed from others, but a resolution of censure was voted down. In spite of the failure to attain perfect accord, it was decided to co-operate with such Liberals as would accept their programme and to confirm the resolution of February 23 creating the Reform League. A week later officers were elected—Edmond Beales was chosen president—and on May 13 the new organization was formally launched at an enthusiastic rally in St. Martin's Hall.³¹

The attempt to unite both classes in one comprehensive association met with but partial success. The bulk of the League membership came from the town artisans. Only a fraction of the middle-class reformers joined, although all gave it their blessing. Those unable to acquiesce fully in the radical programme found an outlet for their energy in the older National Reform Union, founded at Manchester in April, 1864, by George Wilson, John Bright, and other survivors of the Anti-Corn-Law League, with a platform calling for a rating household suffrage and the ballot.

³¹ *Beehive*, Feb. 18–Mar. 25, 1865, Nov. 3–10, 1866; *Miner and Workman's Advocate*, Mar. 18, 1865.

During the next six months the work of organization and expansion went on rapidly, but the hope of bringing the trade-unions as such into the League was doomed to disappointment. Twenty unions at Birmingham, two at Wolverhampton, and three in London joined bodily and became branches,³² but in spite of urgent appeals³³ the vast majority never followed officially. The tradition of "no politics" was still too powerful. What is significant, nevertheless, is that as individuals, with few exceptions, the members went into the agitation with great fervor. The Trades Unionists Manhood Suffrage and Vote by Ballot Association was by common consent merged into the new organization. All their newspapers gave ardent support to the cause. Every important working-class member of the League council and staff of lecturers was a unionist, while the rank and file of the town artisans followed them into the League branches. Later the trades were induced to co-operate officially in demonstrations. Although it cannot be said that the trade-unions were the core of the movement for reform, their members were a most conspicuous element in it; although they did not dominate, they contributed a distinctive feature; they undoubtedly lent driving force and added much to the prestige of the League.

The agitation that followed left Palmerston unmoved. The Prime Minister had set himself against tampering with the constitution and could not be budged, but in October, 1865, came his death, the most important single event in the history of the Second Reform Bill because it let loose all the discontents of the Liberal party. The reform measure of Russell and Gladstone followed, providing for a £7 qualification in the boroughs and £14 in the counties. The Leaguers, who desired manhood suffrage, were disappointed and through Odger made known their feelings to Earl Russell;³⁴ nevertheless, they decided to support it on grounds of expediency.

On the eve of the parliamentary struggle—just when unity among reformers was most necessary—there was dissension within the League. The animosities of the rival trade-union leaders were carried over into the political organization, and President Beales's conciliatory powers were taxed to the utmost when the *Beehive* clique with George Potter at the head was pitted against the stronger faction of Odger and his friends.³⁵ The quarrel came to a head in

³² Howell MSS., Election Reports; *Beehive*, July 1, 1865.

³³ *Beehive*, June 17, 1865.

³⁴ *Workman's Advocate*, Dec. 16, 1865, Jan. 20, 1866.

³⁵ Minutes of the Reform League Executive Council, Aug. 11-18, Dec. 1, 1865; *Beehive*, Aug. 5, 1865, Jan. 5-12, 1867.

February, 1866, when Potter, while remaining nominally a member of the League, organized the Working Men's Association. This body was modelled upon the older organization, but its activity was confined to London. It did render one valuable service: it was the first body to take up the subject of "labor representation", which meant nothing less than placing working-men in the House of Commons. The *Beehive* stated the motive: "A dozen intelligent working-men in Parliament . . . would enlighten middle class opinion and clear away the mist of prejudice in which those classes are now enveloped as to the real motives and conduct of working men generally, but more especially of those to them terrible organizations—trades unions."³⁶ This was the beginning of a movement which, after an extension of the suffrage made it more likely that action would prove fruitful, resulted in the candidacy of Odger, Cremer, Howell, Potter, and some other working-men.

The political activity of the trade-unions was variously viewed by the enfranchised classes. Many Liberals, attributing the antagonism between capital and labor to the exclusion of the latter from political power, hoped to see industrial peace result from the transference of their disputes to the floor of the House of Commons. In the past this argument had appealed to both parties, especially about 1852-1853 and 1857-1859, when the strike weapon was invoked so frequently. In 1859 John Bright said that "the more the men could feel that in the law and the constitution they were upon an equality with their employers and all other classes, the less would they be disposed to combine in narrow sections and trades to wage war, not against their enemies but against the greatest friends they had in the world—the capitalists".³⁷ The *Times*, too, had expressed more than once the opinion that a few representatives in Parliament to voice the views of labor might diminish the number of industrial conflicts:

If some plan can be devised for enabling the manufacturing operatives to vote, without swamping the remaining bodies of electors, the economic errors which embody themselves in "unions" and in "strikes" may soon be eradicated by the influence of free discussion. The Lancashire factory hands might possibly, in the first instance, return a few Socialist demagogues to Parliament, but experience would rapidly convince them of their error; and the consciousness that they had a voice in the councils of the nation would go far to anticipate their periodical outbreaks of discontent.³⁸

³⁶ *Beehive*, Dec. 29, 1866.

³⁷ *Times*, Dec. 8, 1859.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, Aug. 8, 1857. See also *ibid.*, Nov. 16, 1853; *Daily News*, Nov. 10, 1857; Edward Warner, *The Representation of the Working Classes* (London, 1860).

However, it was not such conclusions that prevailed. Strikes and fear of trade-unions told heavily against the reform agitation of the late 'fifties.³⁹ The trades had demonstrated their unity and power. The more conservative minded pictured them as regimented bodies following slavishly the authorities they had set up and acting simultaneously upon the word of command being issued from the trades councils. They had visions of such organizations rapidly expanding and carrying elections by sheer weight of numbers. If such proved the case all sorts of selfish legislation might be expected because, like the Chartists, the unions were supposed to be steeped in economic heresy and socialistic fallacies and secretly plotting the loot of property. The great Conservative quarterly was dismayed:

Upon questions which affect the pecuniary interest of the working men they would work together against the classes above them with all the unanimity they now show in working together against individual employers. The artisan force would be handled in the conduct of elections as they are now handled in the conduct of strikes, with as much promptitude of action and as much exactness of drill. The whole body of artisan voters would be turned over from one candidate to another at a given order, just as they now, like one man, leave the work of an employer or a set of employers at a given signal. The fate of a dissentient artisan who dared to give his vote for the wrong man would be exactly what the fate of a "knob-stick" is now. . . . What is to make them less bold, less dexterous, less unscrupulous, where the national treasury, or the rights of property belonging to the whole middle and upper class are the objects of "loot"?⁴⁰

It was the last that alarmed the Tories. The "terrible organizations of the working men" were stirring, and not dealing with platitudes about "broadening the basis of the constitution" except as a means of bettering wages and securing social reform. If the working-classes ever secured a majority at the polls there would be "no remedy left to the other classes of the community but to emigrate or to submit".⁴¹

Finally, nothing was more potent in inducing Robert Lowe to combat reform than his dislike and fear of the trade-unions. He regarded those combinations as economically wrong and politically dangerous. In his eyes they were engines of tyranny and terrorism, "giving us murder, blinding" and the like, conspiracies which

³⁹ *Beehive*, Jan. 30, 1864; *Times*, Dec. 5, 1866.

⁴⁰ *Quarterly Review*, April, 1866, p. 547. See also *Westminster Review*, April, 1860, p. 505, January, 1867, p. 187; John Austin, *A Plea for the Constitution* (London, 1859), p. 17.

⁴¹ *Quarterly Review*, January, 1866, pp. 262-268.

"ought to continue illegal in any well-governed country".⁴² Better than his contemporaries he perceived that they were only in their infancy and foresaw their enormous expansion.⁴³ Alarmed at their rapid conversion to political action, he feared the possibilities of this tremendous machinery, excellently qualified to become a force in the state if armed with the one thing lacking—the vote.⁴⁴ In one of his philippics of 1866, he said:

the working men of England, finding themselves in a full majority of the whole constituency, will awake to a full sense of their power. They will say, "We can do better for ourselves. Don't let us any longer be cajoled at elections. Let us set up shop for ourselves. We have objects to serve as well as our neighbours, and let us unite to carry those objects. We have machinery; we have our trades unions; we have our leaders all ready. We have the power of combination, as we have shown over and over again; and when we have a prize to fight for we will bring it to bear with tenfold more force than ever before."⁴⁵

Never did a single independent speaker in the House of Commons accomplish more than Lowe, for by his efforts he not only aroused the upper classes to destroy Gladstone's bill, but also at the same time with his taunts stung the masses to action.⁴⁶ Reform was not crushed by the defeat of 1866, but unexpectedly proved to be an Antaeus that returned to the conflict with redoubled vigor. Whatever had been the previous justification for the denial of popular interest in the subject, there could be no doubt of its strength after defeat. The answer to Lowe and the "Adullamites" was an outburst of feeling such as the country had not witnessed since Chartist days.

The first manifestation of the popular temper was during the Hyde Park "riots" of July 23-25, when, after the Home Secretary had denied the use of the Park to the League, a good-natured crowd in spite of the police pushed over the palings and remained in possession for three days.⁴⁷ A number of other meetings followed in the metropolis, in all of which the Junta and their followers were prominent. Late in the summer the campaign was transferred to the country. The League appointed several paid lecturers, among them Odger and Cremer, to carry on the work, but it was John Bright who was the hero of the agitation and the central figure of

⁴² *Quarterly Review*, July, 1867, p. 270; Hansard, third ser., CLXXXII. 2100-2103.

⁴³ *Quarterly Review*, October, 1867, p. 351.

⁴⁴ Hansard, CLXXXII. 2103.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

⁴⁶ Frederick Harrison in the *Fortnightly Review*, VII. 261.

⁴⁷ *Times*, July 24-26, 1866; *Beehive*, July 28, 1866.

the series of great meetings held in the North and in Scotland. In each instance the story is much the same—an attendance that ran into the hundreds of thousands, processions in which tens of thousands marched, huge crowds addressed from many platforms by League and Union orators, and the whole closing with a speech from Bright in the largest hall obtainable.

The first was held at Birmingham on the twenty-seventh of August. The procession was enormous and the most brilliant orator in Great Britain was there, but what attracted the attention of observers was the presence of the trade-unionists—more than ten thousand it was claimed ⁴⁸—marshalled into line by the action of the local trades council. To reformers the action of the trades was the most cheering symptom yet witnessed in connection with the movement. The men of Birmingham had definitely broken the strict tradition of “no politics”, and they waited anxiously to see if the precedent would be followed elsewhere.

Their hopes were fulfilled. At Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow, and Edinburgh the trades turned out in imposing array.⁴⁹ At Glasgow they were especially well represented, for Alexander Campbell of the Trades Council and Alexander Macdonald of the miners were pioneers in political agitation. Each society, headed by a band, with flags and banners waving, exhibited specimens of the product of its own particular craft. The shipbuilders carried their tools and bore aloft on poles a series of miniature ships in various stages of construction. The banners had appropriate inscriptions. At Edinburgh the brushmakers proposed to make a “clean sweep of the Cave”, the wheelwrights would put their shoulders to the wheel, the bookbinders wished to “forward” and “finish” the work of reform, the engineers resolved to “keep the steam up”, the shoemakers maintained that there was “nothing like leather” if the constitution was to wear, the cabinet-makers thought they should choose the Queen’s government, and the painters claimed that the edifice of the state could not be complete without a touch from the decorators. With such support Bright could no longer lament that reform was lifeless. The “dead horse” had come to life and needed no flogging to run a good race.

In December the centre of interest shifted once more to London. The success of Birmingham in bringing out organized labor encouraged the Working Men’s Association to attempt a similar demonstration. The co-operation of the Reform League was secured, al-

⁴⁸ *Commonwealth*, Aug. 25, 1866; *Beehive*, Sept. 1, 1866.

⁴⁹ *Times*, Sept. 25, Oct. 9, 17, Nov. 19, 1866.

though there were protests from the Junta against participation in anything under the management of George Potter. Because of the hostility of certain landlords some difficulty was experienced in securing suitable grounds, but a concession by Lord Ranelagh enabled them to hold the demonstration on the third as scheduled. In spite of a drenching rain with its accompaniment of mud and slush a goodly number were in line with bands and banners—the *Times*'s estimate was 25,000 and the *Beehive*'s 35,000—while ten times as many spectators watched them as they marched to Fulham singing a song composed for the occasion, "The Trades are Mustering". At Beaufort House grounds the crowd patiently endured the miserable weather while listening to the oratory of Beales, George Jacob Holyoake, and the leaders of the Working Men's Association. On the evening of the next day the demonstration closed with an indoor gathering at St. James Hall with Potter in the chair and Bright as the chief speaker.⁵⁰

That the first political demonstration of the London trade-unions created a deep impression was not to be doubted. It was no slight success to induce so many thousands to brave the inclement weather, to forego a day's wages that could be ill spared in almost every case, and to risk dismissal by hostile employers—actually carried out in several instances, as the "victim lists" in the *Beehive* show⁵¹—all The *Times*, never friendly to the unions as a political power and in order to testify quietly yet effectively to their political aspirations. somewhat apprehensive as December 3 drew near, was reassured and much impressed by the irreproachable demeanor of the marchers; it commented upon the superior appearance of the representatives of many trades and the "long lines of well-dressed, well-to-do artisans"; it noted with satisfaction that not a single case of drunkenness was observed in the ranks, and especially the quiet and peaceable bearing of the men—"a more orderly set of people never came together in any country". It concluded: "What was done yesterday . . . is amply sufficient to show that a large number of the artisan class desire the franchise, and that there is no reason to believe they will abuse it."⁵²

Meantime the League was preparing for the climax of its campaign in a grand demonstration at the opening of Parliament. Activity in the country slackened, the lecturers were recalled to London, and attention was concentrated upon getting the trade, benefit,

⁵⁰ *Times*, Dec. 4-5, 1866; *Beehive*, Aug. 18, Dec. 8, 1866.

⁵¹ *Beehive*, Dec. 8-22, 1866; *Times*, Dec. 12, 1866.

⁵² *Times*, Dec. 4, 1866.

and temperance societies into line. A delegate meeting in January, 1867, secured the same co-operation that had been given the Working Men's Association and soon the committee men, writers, painters, and banner-makers were hard at work preparing for the eleventh of February. It was planned to confine the affair to a procession and indoor speaking at Agricultural Hall, Islington—"in the interest of peace and order, and to avoid any semblance of force", such as had occurred at Hyde Park.⁵³ At a meeting of the Trades Council attended by delegates of the constituent unions William Allan moved to advise the branches to participate in the forthcoming event, and in striking contrast to the reception of similar proposals earlier in the 'sixties the motion was carried unanimously amid hearty cheers.⁵⁴ The International Working Men's Association, in which Odger and Howell were influential, also accepted an invitation to send a deputation.⁵⁵

The procession on the eleventh resembled that of the previous December. Once more the trades turned out and filled the sections reserved for them, so that members of Parliament arriving for the session could see for themselves the enthusiasm of the metropolitan artisans. After the day was over the League kept up its connection with the unions.⁵⁶

By the time Parliament assembled the great demonstrations had accomplished their purpose: the intensity of popular feeling was now universally acknowledged. The *Quarterly Review* admitted that the ministers yielded not to argument or sentiment but were converted by the mobs who beat down the palings of Hyde Park or went marching with bands and banners in the towns of the North.⁵⁷ The *Edinburgh Review* remarked that the enthusiasm for the cause was genuine.⁵⁸ The *Westminster Review* declared that the former apathy had given place to an excitement far too intense to be allayed by palliatives.⁵⁹ The impressions of the *Times* after December 3 have already been noted.

The rallies showed liberalism and labor working together harmoniously in a manner unknown since 1832. Bright and other members of Parliament were cheered by vast throngs of workingmen. Wealthy reformers were generous donors to the cause. The

⁵³ Howell to Bright, Reform League Letter-Book, 1866-1867, p. 492.

⁵⁴ Minute Book of the London Trades Council, Dec. 19, 1866.

⁵⁵ Minute Book of the First International, pp. 53, 59, 71.

⁵⁶ *Times*, Feb. 12, 1867; *Commonwealth*, Feb. 12, 1867.

⁵⁷ *Quarterly Review*, October, 1867, pp. 555-556.

⁵⁸ *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1867, p. 286.

⁵⁹ *Westminster Review*, January, 1867, p. 185.

demonstrations cost a good round sum, which the trade-unions and the working-men of the League could never have afforded. It came from Sir Wilfrid Lawson, P. A. Taylor, Samuel Morley, and others of the Liberal party through George Howell.⁶⁰ In this alliance the trade-unions were an invaluable factor. Nothing created more dismay in the minds of the ruling oligarchy than was aroused when those organizations broke the traditions of the past and engaged in political agitation—"The condition of Trades' Unions is daily acquiring more importance and engrossing more attention", said the *Times*. "Symptoms are not wanting which show that these bodies are likely to play as disastrous a part in politics as they are said to do in trade."⁶¹

Except for the Hyde Park affair the campaign had been decidedly peaceful, but occasionally there was an intimation of what might be expected if the wishes of an aroused populace were ignored. In spite of the well-known policy of the League and the Junta the expediency of physical force was openly discussed. The *Commonwealth* announced its opinion that if all else failed such a threat was not impolitic. Banners inscribed "Reform or Revolution" were prepared for the trades demonstration, but were denounced by the League. Charles Bradlaugh published a pamphlet with the same slogan as a title. Suggestions for a People's Parliament like that of the Chartists were broached. An association was organized to further the plan and an attempt made to interest the League, but it was negatived by the council. The "ulterior measures" of Chartism also received an airing when George Potter revived the idea of the general strike and even Beales hinted that if the demands of the League were not conceded the answer would be non-payment of taxes.⁶² It seemed possible that history might repeat itself. The Junta and the League, like William Lovett's Working Men's Association and the Birmingham Political Union of an earlier day, began with a programme of moral force and class co-operation; but if peaceful effort had proven fruitless, would a violent phase have ensued like that which closed the decade of the 'thirties? There was some economic discontent for a foundation and the Sheffield outrages proved that violence was still possible. While no one wanted trouble and rioting or revolution was certainly not in sight, yet there were symptoms that an ugly situation might develop—by no means without effect on a generation that still remem-

⁶⁰ Reform League Cash Book, Letter-Book, March, 1867.

⁶¹ *Times*, Jan. 26, 1867.

⁶² *Commonwealth*, Oct. 26, Nov. 24, Dec. 15, 1866; *Times*, Mar. 4, 1867.

bered Chartism. A Conservative government read the signs of the times and promised concessions.

The grand demonstrations had won. Derby and Disraeli were converted and introduced a measure, but there still remained the task of transforming it into a truly democratic one by the elimination of "fancy franchises" and the provisions for direct payment of rates. In April the agitation redoubled and into it the trades entered all the more vigorously because of a recent decision of the Court of Queen's Bench⁶³ which virtually asserted that the unions had no legal status and left them without protection for their funds. Moreover, a royal commission was at work investigating the unions. Feeling their position assailed on all sides the trades threw themselves into the fray. Hints of force grew more pronounced. The *Commonwealth* predicted that the future historian of the reform movement would have to write the word "blood" ere he ended his task, for the people were in no mood to be trifled with; it mentioned the possibility of a union of the English democracy with discontent in Ireland, and that the reform agitation might drift into a war of classes.⁶⁴ At a League meeting attended by union delegates Cremer carried a resolution to consider the propriety of a general strike unless a democratic measure was conceded.⁶⁵ Such explosions of wrath were the escape of pent-up enthusiasm and irritation and are not to be taken too seriously. It is extremely doubtful if even Potter would have sanctioned an appeal to force, but it is indicative of the tensiety of the atmosphere that partisans of the Junta should have departed so far from their customary caution.

It was 1832 over again—reformers of all classes united in peaceful demonstration but with the possibility of violence from a disappointed people looming up in the background. It resulted in the passage of a vastly different measure from that with which the opportunist Disraeli first confronted the House. With the consequent admission of the town working-man to the franchise a democratic representation in Parliament was for the first time possible.

The trade-union leaders felt that a great victory had been won, but that much was left to be done. There was no odor of "finality" about the Bill of 1867; they would be satisfied only when every man had a vote and no man more than one. They could not rest while such unionists as the miners and stockingers, who lived mostly outside the boroughs, had not the franchise. But it was an entering

⁶³ Hornby v. Close.

⁶⁴ *Commonwealth*, Apr. 27, 1867.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, May 4, 1867.

wedge and, as Joseph Leicester, a glass-worker, said, a door partially opened could be easily forced. That task, however, was postponed for another day; it was sufficient for the present to gather in the fruits of their victory. First of all they would insure their right to organize and the safety of their funds; then they would put working-men in Parliament and elect Liberals who would reform the crying evils and equalize the burdens in the state.⁶⁶ By no means all their hopes were realized, but in the following years Robert Lowe's prediction of the growth of the trade-unions was fulfilled and neither of the great parties could afford to ignore them. A democratic suffrage made inevitable the measures for social reform, both Liberal and Conservative, of the next half-century, and without it the Labor party could not exist. Truly, the trades to-day may congratulate themselves upon the abandonment of "no politics" and their invaluable contribution toward the winning of the Second Reform Bill.

CARL F. BRAND.

⁶⁶ *Beehive*, Aug. 10, Oct. 5-12, Nov. 16, 1867.

THE SUPPLY OF GUNPOWDER IN 1776¹

ONE of the most serious problems faced by the colonists during the first two and a half years of the American Revolution was that of obtaining an adequate supply of gunpowder. At the beginning of that period the situation of the Americans as to a supply of powder was like that of the South at the opening of the Civil War. The total store in the South in 1860 was about 60,000 pounds, a relic of the Mexican War.² The Southern states had always depended upon the North for supplies of the explosive, but after the attack on Fort Sumter that source was shut off.³ In fifty years scarcely a pound had been manufactured in the Southern states. The colonies in 1775, like the South nearly a century later, were mainly devoted to agriculture. When the Civil War came on, there were almost no workmen skilled in the making of powder, there was no saltpetre in store at any Southern point, and the blockade made it impossible to obtain either saltpetre or powder abroad.⁴ In spite of the difficulties the South turned its attention to the manufacture of powder, and the success which rewarded its efforts enabled it to keep up the struggle until its internal resources were all but exhausted and its transportation had broken down.⁵

In 1775, the greater part of the powder stored in the colonial magazines had lain there since the Seven Years' War. The few powder-mills were in ruins, the manufacture of the explosive was almost a lost art, and the country was nearly destitute of ammunition and other warlike stores.⁶ Any hope of getting munitions from England which may have survived the adoption of the non-importation agreement of December, 1774, was destroyed by the outbreak of hostilities in the following spring. Then, as ninety-six years after when Fort Sumter was fired upon, there was no going back. As the determination to resist became general, the colonists hastened to procure the stores of powder readily at hand, whether the property

¹ A paper read at the meeting of the American Historical Association at Columbus, Dec. 27, 1923.

² Jefferson Davis, *Short History of the Confederate States of America*, pp. 113-121.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ New York Historical Society, *Collections*, XI. (1878) 35; *Journals of the Continental Congress*, II. 84, 85, 86, 223; *Journals of each Provincial Congress of Massachusetts*, p. 64.

of private persons or of the crown. If the non-importation agreement were to be respected, the hope of the colonists lay in collecting every ounce within reach and in manufacturing as much more as their resources would permit. Should the resulting quantities prove inadequate, it would be necessary to increase the supply by importations, the "agreement" notwithstanding. In the Civil War, the steady pressure of the blockade reduced the Confederacy to a degree of destitution which made further support of her armies impossible. In the recent World War, France would have suffered a like experience had she not been able to procure coal and iron from England. But during the first two and a half years of the American Revolution the colonists' success in importing powder enabled them to keep going until victory was their final reward. The full importance of these imports can be appreciated only by a study of the situation of the colonists as to a store of powder in 1775, together with a study of their efforts to manufacture.

In Massachusetts and Virginia simultaneous attempts were made to forestall the colonists in their determination to secure possession of the local magazines. In the Bay colony General Gage set up a ferment of excitement when he seized the Charlestown arsenal and withheld "the powder lodged in the magazine of the town of Boston from the legal proprietors".⁷ Within a few hours of the time when the minute-men faced the redcoats on Lexington green and at Concord bridge, Governor Dunmore, down in Virginia, laid hold of the principal supplies in the Old Dominion.⁸ News of these proceedings soon reached the remote regions of the colonies, where the zeal of many was fired into adopting retaliatory measures. In December, 1774, an attack was made on Fort William and Mary at Jerry's Point (Portsmouth) in New Hampshire, and in due time 10,100 pounds of powder were appropriated.⁹ In May, 1775, the "Liberty Boys" in Savannah, Georgia, seized 600 pounds stored in the magazine of that town, and, July 10, one of the king's ships was boarded and something like 12,700 pounds were carried away.¹⁰

⁷ *Journals of each Provincial Congress of Massachusetts*, pp. 256, 257, 428, 430, 570, 606, 755, 756.

⁸ B. J. Lossing, *Pictorial Field-Book of the Revolution*, II. 503; Virginia Historical Society, *Collections*, VI. 82, 83, 84, 86.

⁹ *Provincial Papers of New Hampshire*, VII. 421-424; New Hampshire Historical Society, *Collections*, VII. 14.

¹⁰ J. C. Harris, *Stories from American History*, pp. 53-55; *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, ed. Burnett, I. 170; Edward McCrady, *South Carolina in the Revolution*, I. 16-22; *Extracts from the Diary of Christopher Marshall*, ed. Duane, p. 33; South Carolina Historical Society, *Collections*, II. 49, 50, 51, 55.

In addition, by various means, there were secured some 5000 pounds in New Hampshire, 12,000 in Massachusetts, 4000 in Connecticut, and 17,000 in Rhode Island. New York and New Jersey yielded very little; but 4000 pounds were collected in Pennsylvania, a like amount in Maryland, in the Carolinas 9000 pounds, while Virginia and Georgia yielded around 2000 pounds. Though many people "were in a manner destitute" of powder when the war began, nevertheless the rebellious colonists succeeded in procuring within the colonies something like 80,000 pounds of powder.¹¹

Largely in response to Washington's urgent and repeated calls for even the smallest quantities, more than half of this total was sent to Cambridge during the first few months after hostilities began.¹² Part of the remainder was distributed to different towns, where it was drawn upon for the use of local levies of troops.¹³ A considerable portion also was sent for the use of the troops operating along the northern lakes, and some was carted to Canada, where Arnold once pleaded for a supply "for God's sake".¹⁴ Everywhere the explosive was expended in reckless fashion, especially at Cambridge.¹⁵ When Washington arrived to take command, little remained of the great quantity which had been sent to the camp.¹⁶ On the third of August, when a review of the situation was taken, there was not enough powder in the whole army to furnish half a pound to each man exclusive of what was held in the horns and cartridge-boxes.¹⁷ By the last of the month Washington's supply was nearly gone and he had none with which to employ his artillery.¹⁸ All the cannon were silent except a small nine-pounder which occasionally fired from a point of vantage on Prospect Hill.¹⁹ Looking down on Boston from that height General Greene, in a letter to Henry Ward, wrote:

¹¹ The figures given in this paragraph are the result of a study of the colonial records, correspondence of the times, and other source-material.

¹² *New Hampshire Provincial Papers*, VII. 4, 6, 12, 13, 478, 521, 558, 571, 572, 581; C. H. Bell, *History of Exeter, N. H.*, pp. 241, 242; *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, III. 14, 64, 65, 77, 99, 100, 101, 248, 334, 342, 354, 371, 387, 403, 430, 502, 503; McCrady, *South Carolina in the Revolution*, I. 20; S. C. Hist. Soc., *Collections*, II. 49, 50, 51, 52, 55; *Journals of Congress*, III. 90; *Continental Congress Letters*, ed. Burnett, I. 148, 149, 165; *Colonial Records of Connecticut*, XV. 84-85; Force, *Am. Arch.*, fourth ser., VI. 419, 420.

¹³ *Conn. Col. Recs.*, XIV. 433, XV. 40-41, 84-85, 86, 87, 100, 180; *Journals of each Provincial Congress*, pp. 215 ff.

¹⁴ *Conn. Col. Recs.*, XV. 100.

¹⁵ *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, III. 57 ff.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, III. 64, 65. See also citations under note 7.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, III. 54, 64.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, III. 99, 100, 101, 387, 462.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, III. 100, 101.

"Oh, that we had plenty of powder; I should then hope to see something done here for the honour of America."²⁰ On Christmas Day, 1775, Washington wrote: "Our want of powder is inconceivable. A daily waste and no supply administers a gloomy prospect."²¹ Three weeks later there was not a pound in his magazines, and in Connecticut, where he hoped to obtain a supply, no more than 728 pounds could be collected for his men.²² At the end of the first nine months of the war practically all the powder originally in the colonies had been used, as well as a quantity of imported powder; and for nearly two months no large supplies were brought to the camp.²³ When a stock finally did arrive Washington seized Dorchester Heights, where he commanded both the town of Boston and the British fleet. But if, in January, 1776, Howe had learned the feeble state of the American forces, he could have marched out to Cambridge and crushed the newly recruited colonial army. After that it would have been a simple matter to dispose of the sick and disheartened troops who would soon be beating a straggling retreat from Canada, and thus the Revolution would have ended.²⁴ As it was, the British commander was forced out of Boston, and Washington was given an opportunity to move on New York.

The knowledge of the scarcity of powder in 1775, and the evident needs of Washington's men at Cambridge and of those in Canada, explains the celerity with which the colonial governments and the Second Continental Congress acted to increase the supply by manufacture and import. Soon after Congress met in Philadelphia, the manufacture of powder was considered.²⁵ Members seem to have held that the manufacture of saltpetre and powder was primarily within the prerogative of the colonial governments rather than within that of Congress, though that body evolved one elaborate plan for producing the nitrate. Agents were sent out by Congress in the hope that they would succeed in extracting the "nitrous salt" from earthen floors of the buildings and yards in the Southern colonies where tobacco was inspected and stored.²⁶ Nothing of consequence ever came of this project. On the other hand, virtually all the saltpetre and powder produced in the colonies was made as a result of the support given by the new colonial (or state) governments.

²⁰ Force, *Am. Arch.*, fourth ser., IV. 312.

²¹ *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, III. 299.

²² *Conn. Col. Recs.*, XIV. 433, XV. 84-85, 100, 231.

²³ Force, *Am. Arch.*, fourth ser., IV. 1203, 1238.

²⁴ *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, III. 428, 429, 432.

²⁵ *Journals of Congress*, II. 84, 85, 107, 218, 219, III. 296, 345-347, 355, IV. 170, 171, 185, 186, 396.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, III. 345-346, 347, 349, 352, 369.

It was expected that the great centres for the manufacture of these substances would be located in the colonies of New York and Pennsylvania.²⁷ John Adams was enthusiastic over the prospects in Philadelphia. "Germans and others here have an opinion", he wrote James Warren, June 27, 1775, "that every stable, Dove house, Cellar, Vault, etc., is a Mine of Salt Petre. The inclosed Proclamation, coincides with this opinion. The Mould under stables, etc., may be boiled soon into salt Petre it is said. Numbers are about it here."²⁸ Printed "systems" describing processes of manufacturing were sent by Congress to the different colonial governments, urging immediate attention to the subject.²⁹ Massachusetts needed no urging, nor did some of the other colonies after the news of the events at Lexington and Concord had stirred them to action. In the Bay colony, official interest, manifested as early as December, 1774, was maintained throughout 1775 and 1776. Virginia gave encouragement to the work in March, 1775, Connecticut in May, and in June of that year the activity was given legal support by New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. North Carolina's official interest began in September, that of Maryland in December, and that of New York and New Jersey in March, 1776. In each colony legislation as a rule provided for the erection of both private and public saltpetre "works" and for one or more powder-mills. Financial support was guaranteed, and liberal bounties were offered to those first to manufacture specified quantities of saltpetre or powder, or both.³⁰ The opportunity to turn their patriotism to a profit inspired many to engage in the business of manufacturing these substances, though in Georgia during the early months of the war "no kind of manufactures" were started.³¹

In Massachusetts and Pennsylvania the first successes were attained. Not a great way from the place where Washington sat brooding over the hopelessness of his situation, a little group of men were rejoicing over the result of a test of some powder manufactured at Weymouth from saltpetre produced within the colony. A

²⁷ *Ibid.*, II. 84-86.

²⁸ Mass. Hist. Soc., *Collections*, LXXII. 66-67, 68 (*Warren-Adams Letters*, vol. I.). The manufacture of saltpetre by modern processes did not begin until after the middle of the last century. Sir Edward Thorpe, *Dictionary of Applied Chemistry*, IV. 342; Roscoe and Schorlemmer, *Treatise on Chemistry*, vol. II., pt. I, pp. 60-90.

²⁹ *Journals of Congress*, II. 84, 85, 107, 218, 219, III. 296, 310, 311, 345-346, 347, 355, IV. 170, 171, 185, 186, 396.

³⁰ The proceedings referred to may easily be found in the records of the colonies or in Force's *Archives*.

³¹ Force, *Am. Arch.*, fourth ser., V. 1106.

committee of the Provincial Congress reported, January 23, 1776, that the powder was "very good; and at the same time laid on the table two flatted leaden balls which were discharged from a small-arm, loaded with two inches of powder, into a tough white-oak tree, at the distance of eight rods, which penetrated the tree two inches".³²

In Pennsylvania, during the latter part of 1775, one Oswell Eve "established", as he said, "the making of powder in this Province, which had not been carried on to any extent before".³³ Prior to the fall of 1777, as a result of the powder-making activity in these and other colonies, there were produced from saltpetre extracted locally some 115,000 pounds of powder.³⁴

It is very probable that this was the maximum amount which could be manufactured in the face of existing conditions. It was produced during the time when the wave of Revolutionary enthusiasm was rising to its crest. Nearly all of it was produced between January and November, 1776, when much "hard money" was still in circulation and when it did not take, as Christopher Marshall, the Philadelphia Quaker, notes in his diary, more than forty-five dollars in Continental money for the purchase of a pound of shingle nails.³⁵ This powder came from the mills before the price of labor and materials had reached exorbitant heights. Nearly all of it was manufactured after the supply originally in the colonies had been used, when the demands were greatest, and when the distress for want of the explosive was "inconceivable". At the beginning of the year 1776, Washington saw the hopelessness of equipping a force "without any money in our treasury, powder in our magazines, arms in our stores. . . . and by and by, when we shall be called upon to take the field, shall not have a tent to lie in".³⁶ Fortunately for Washington, however, and for the cause he championed, Howe evacuated Boston March 17, 1776, without ever having discovered what the true plight of the American forces had been.

The outlook at that time certainly was not bright. But powder kept coming in from outside, and these supplies, added to the quantities manufactured, at least partly filled the needs of the continent. Between January and July, 1776, more powder was distributed for the use of the troops operating in the different fields, for the numerous privateers, and for the various forts, than the total quan-

³² Force, *Am. Arch.*, fourth ser., IV. 1410.

³³ *Ibid.*, fourth ser., IV. 498, V. 464.

³⁴ This estimate is based on a detailed study of the sources.

³⁵ *Diary of Christopher Marshall*, ed. Duane, app. H, p. 300.

³⁶ *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, III. 342.

tity manufactured from saltpetre extracted locally during the first two and a half years of the war.³⁷

From the opening of hostilities, in anticipation of the dearth of powder, the Continental Congress, the different colonial governments, and even private individuals attempted to import saltpetre and powder as well as manufacture them at home.³⁸ Georgia seems to have been the only colony which did not import either of these before the fall of 1777. The imports into the other colonies previous to that time reveal the success achieved:

Colony	Pounds of saltpetre	Pounds of powder
Massachusetts	21,750.....	193,980
New Hampshire		138,200
Connecticut	14,500.....	90,480
Rhode Island		48,000
New York		53,300
New Jersey	48,000.....	56,000
Pennsylvania	394,000.....	604,975
Maryland		170,725
Virginia		62,000
North Carolina		12,845
South Carolina		23,705
Total	478,250	1,454,210

Nearly all of this 478,250 pounds of imported saltpetre was manufactured into powder before the fall of 1777, producing 698,245 pounds of the explosive.

The total amount of powder available for Continental purposes prior to the battle of Saratoga can now be computed. The amount is represented by the sum of the 80,000 pounds on hand when the Revolution began, the 115,000 pounds manufactured from internal sources of saltpetre, the 698,245 produced from the saltpetre imported, and the 1,454,210 pounds of imported powder, in all about 2,347,455 pounds. It appears therefore that well over 90 per cent. of all the powder available for carrying on the Revolution during the first two and a half years of the struggle for independence was obtained from outside the country.³⁹

³⁷ *Journals of Congress*, IV. 48, 53, 73, 124, 125, 128, 156, 175, 183, 187, 213, 225, 250, 257, 291, 304, 310, 323, 325, 331, 332, 396, V. 427, 431, 470, 478, 484; *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, III. 428, IV. 176; *Force, Am. Arch.*, fourth ser., IV. 516-517, 955, 1146, V. 84, 250, 283, 826, 1225, VI. 653, 660, 1283, 1284, 1285, 1289; fifth ser., I. 1423; *Continental Congress Letters*, ed. Burnett, I. 380; *Letters to Washington*, ed. Sparks, I. 128.

³⁸ *Journals of Congress*, II. 66, 67, 74, 106, 173, 184, 210, 211, III. 361, IV. 53, V. 328, VI. 867, VII. 274, VIII. 533, 534; *Warren-Adams Letters*, I. 55; *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, III. 82.

³⁹ More than 50,000 small arms were brought in with this powder, but it is possible that the colonists could have done very well without them.

In the consideration of the above figures certain questions naturally arise. In the first place, did the colonists have any sources of powder other than those already discussed? Where did the imported supplies come from, and how were they obtained? When did they arrive, and why were they not taken prize by the British? What was the attitude of the French government in the matter of allowing military stores to be shipped to the rebellious Americans? And, finally, what would have been the result had the colonists been forced to depend for powder solely on the small quantities on hand in 1775, together with such other supplies as they could manufacture from internal sources of saltpetre?

Considering the questions in order, it should be noted that there was a possibility of capturing supplies of powder from the enemy. But the land operations of the Revolution prior to the Saratoga campaign were in general very much in favor of the British, and their losses of powder and other military stores were small as compared to the losses of the Americans.⁴⁰ From the destruction of the stores at Concord in 1775 to the blowing up of the magazine at Fort George in the midsummer of 1777, the Americans lost a great many tons of powder.⁴¹ On the sea the ships captured by the Americans were laden chiefly with provisions or products of the West Indies, though some of them carried valuable military stores.⁴² As a rule these prizes did not carry powder, though one valuable cargo was taken, in May, 1776, by the Continental cruiser *Franklin*.⁴³ But it may be doubted whether all the powder taken from the British on the seas would balance or even approach the American losses afloat, wherein were comprised the magazines of the captured priva-

⁴⁰ *Cont. Cong. Letters*, I. 247; *N. H. Prov. Papers*, VII. 637; *Pa. Arch.*, V. 454; Marshall, *Diary*, pp. 109, 111; Charles Stedman, *History of the American War*, I. 167; *Letters of R. H. Lee*, ed. Ballagh, I. 171, 195.

⁴¹ Mass. Hist. Soc., *Collections*, fifth ser., X. 89, 284 (*Trumbull Papers*, vol. II.); Lieut. Hadden's *Journal*, pp. 84, 85, 107; Lieut. Digby's *Journal* (Albany, 1887), p. 223; *R. I. Col. Recs.*, VII. 548; Force, *Am. Arch.*, fifth ser., III. 740; Marshall, *Diary*, pp. 134, 135; *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, V. 297, 298; St. Clair's *Papers*, I. 421; F. S. Drake, *Life and Corr. of Henry Knox*, p. 50; *Letters to Washington*, ed. Sparks, I. 512.

⁴² Force, *Am. Arch.*, fifth ser., III. 1523-1530; fourth ser., VI. 1113, 1114. See index to each volume of the *Archives* for the names of these ships. *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, III. 261-262, IV. 249, 314, 318, 319; Marshall, *Diary*, pp. 88, 95, 96; *Warren-Adams Letters*, I. 317.

⁴³ Force, *Am. Arch.*, fourth ser., VI. 495, 496, 629, 1113, 1114; fifth ser., I. 405, 552, III. 823, 824, 939; *Journals of Congress*, V. 619; Marshall, *Diary*, pp. 59, 73; Stedman, *History of the American War*, I. 167; Wharton, *Rev. Dipl. Corr.*, II. 94; *Boston Gazette*, Nov. 4, 1776, and May 12, June 9, July 10, 1777; *Freeman's Journal and New Hampshire Gazette*, Oct. 12, 1776.

teers as well as cargoes of powder consigned to patriot destination.⁴⁴ All things considered, it is probable that there is not enough difference on either side seriously to affect our conclusions.

Another thing that should be noted is that practically all the powder imported during the first two and a half years of the war came from France by way of the West Indies, many of the carrying ships merely touching at those islands on their way to colonial ports.⁴⁵ In the main, these supplies were obtained in exchange for colonial products, some of which went no farther than the West Indies, while some were forwarded to France.⁴⁶ Probably 80 per cent. of the imported saltpetre and powder reaching our shores came as a direct result of the efforts put forth by authorities in the different colonies and by the Continental Congress.⁴⁷

During the period under consideration, over one hundred different ships brought supplies to our shores. From this we conclude that the patrol of British war-ships along the Atlantic coast fell far short of establishing an effective blockade, and that full advantage was taken of the chances of getting through. Furthermore the arrival of so many vessels suggests that the French government both secretly encouraged and, at times, openly connived at the illicit business carried on by her merchants in France and in the West Indies.⁴⁸ Had there been a serious inclination on the part of the French government to do so, doubtless it could have put a stop to the

⁴⁴ *Freeman's Journal and New Hampshire Gazette*, Aug. 31 and Oct. 12, 1776, and Apr. 7, 1777. See the index to each volume of the *Archives*. Wharton, *Rev. Dipl. Corr.*, II. 328; *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, III. 269; *Journals of Congress*, VIII. 465, 466; Marshall, *Diary*, p. 99; *Warren-Adams Letters*, I. 313, 314; Force, *Am. Arch.*, fourth ser., IV. 1134, 1135, VI. 1414, 1415; fifth ser., I. 659.

⁴⁵ The citations used in support of these statements were the same as were used in compiling the table on p. 277, *ante*. See also *Am. Arch.*, fourth ser., IV. 353, 354, 658, 659, 660, 1103, 1202, 1276, 1277, 1309, VI. 1560; fifth ser., I. 862, III. 668, 1065; Wharton, *Rev. Dipl. Corr.*, II. 82, 113, 252, 262, 268-269, 278, 323, 349, 382, 387, 392, 433, 434; *Journals of Congress*, IV. 119, 120, 130, 131, 176, 193-194, VI. 930-931; *N. H. State Papers*, VIII. 74, 75, 303, 304, 385-386, 549; *Letters of R. H. Lee*, ed. Ballagh, I. 157; *Documents on the American Revolution*, ed. John Durand, p. 107; G. Williams, *History of the Liverpool Privateers*, pp. 193, 201; *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, V. 385; *Cont. Cong. Letters*, ed. Burnett, I. 299, 304; S. C. Hist. Soc., *Collections*, II. 40, 57, 62, 63, III. 39, 40, 108; *Boston Gazette*, Nov. 4, 1776; N. Y. Hist. Soc., *Collections*, 1879, p. 130; R. I. Hist. Soc., *Collections*, VI. 145; *Conn. Col. Recs.*, XV. 261; *Journals of each Provincial Congress of Massachusetts*, p. 405.

⁴⁶ The statements are based on those references cited in compiling the table on p. 277.

⁴⁷ *Id.*

⁴⁸ *Id.*

shipping of military stores to the Americans. The total quantity of powder and other munitions allowed to come here from France and from ports under French control helps in a way to measure the desire of the French government to break up the British colonial empire and secure a part of it for France. It helps also to measure her disappointment at not being able to retrieve her losses of 1763.

So far investigation has failed to reveal the names or the extent of the activities of all the persons in France who furnished the colonists with warlike stores in the several months before the arrival of Silas Deane, the secret agent of Congress. There can be no doubt, however, that to M. Caron de Beaumarchais chief credit is due for the stores obtained at this time, as well as for those obtained after his dealings with Deane began. The commercial house of Beaumarchais, under the fanciful name of "Roderique Hortalez et Cie.," had been in operation many weeks when Deane saw the "Watchmaker to His Majesty" for the first time, and from that house great quantities of munitions had been sent.⁴⁹ It took several weeks for a vessel to cover the distance from French to American ports by way of the West Indies, so that even if Deane had succeeded in sending a ship-load of munitions within a few weeks after his arrival in Paris, July 7, 1776, it could not possibly have docked on this side until very late that year.⁵⁰ But by that time nearly nine-tenths of the imports listed in the above table had reached our ports, the larger part of them unloading at Philadelphia, where Congress took them in charge. It is possible that Arthur Lee deserves more credit for his part in procuring supplies from France during the early months of the war than he has yet been accorded.

In conclusion it may be said that there was no time during the first two and a half years of the Revolution when the colonies had nearly enough powder for their needs. The writings of civil and military leaders of the time are crowded with expressions bemoaning the scarcity of powder; and many a military movement was either not attempted or was abandoned because of this lack.⁵¹ Even as late as July, 1777, Schuyler wrote Washington from Saratoga that his "prospect of preventing them [the British] from penetrating is

⁴⁹ Wharton, *Rev. Dipl. Corr.*, II. 74, 87, 92, 95, 97, 106, 122, 154, 174, 190, 200, 201, 207, 209, 211, 222, 223, 248, 276.

⁵⁰ *Warren-Adams Letters*, I. 318; *Boston Gazette*, Aug. 12, 1776, July 21, Oct. 6, 1777. The first considerable supply of munitions to arrive as a result of Deane's efforts did not reach an American port until the spring of 1777.

⁵¹ *Letters to Washington*, ed. Sparks, I. 394-395; *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, III. 29, 57, 184; *Cont. Cong. Letters*, ed. Burnett, I. 100, 387.

not much. They have an army flushed with victory, plentifully provided with provisions, cannon, and every warlike store. Our army . . . is weak in numbers, dispirited, naked, in a manner, destitute of provisions, without camp equipage, with little ammunition, and not a single piece of cannon".⁵² In due time Gates, Schuyler's successor, received the needed supplies, and many of them had lately come from France.⁵³ If the Americans had barely been able to continue the struggle up to that point when their available supply of powder was well over 2,300,000 pounds, what would have been the result if less than ten per cent. of that amount had been available?

In the light of all the foregoing it may be stated with some degree of assurance that if it had not been for the great quantities of powder obtained by importations from France before the Saratoga campaign, the Revolution would have broken down long before that time.

ORLANDO W. STEPHENSON.

⁵² *Letters to Washington*, ed. Sparks, I. 394-395; *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, V. 483.

⁵³ G. L. Clark, *Silas Deane, a Connecticut Leader in the American Revolution*, pp. 90-91; *Journals of Congress*, VIII. 476; *Public Records of the State of Connecticut*, I. 217, 335-336, 363, 364.

AN INTERPRETATION OF CIVIL WAR FINANCE

THE final report of the Confederate Secretary of the Treasury was dated October 1, 1864.¹ The official debt of the Confederacy as then reported was \$1,687,310,298. The report was made six months before the termination of the struggle. Had the debt continued to increase until the end of the war at the same rate as it had increased during the previous six months, it would have totalled \$2,345,297,823.²

These figures, along with others which purport to give the cost of the war to the South, are easily obtained and well known to historians. Nevertheless they are very seldom quoted. Does it not seem strange that the cost of so important a struggle should not have attracted the attention and received the comments of the writers interested in the history of that period? This consistent neglect of these statistics is easily explained. Students realize that the figures are misleading rather than enlightening.

Statistics may be designed to misrepresent facts. The secretaries in making their reports had no such intent. There is a more apparent explanation. The fortunes of the war and the financial policy of the Confederacy discredited its financial integrity. As a consequence, its currency depreciated and constantly fluctuated in value. December, 1863, in the very middle of a four-year struggle, the value of the Confederate dollar had fallen so low that it was worth only 5 cents in gold; it seldom rose above that exchange value thereafter, and during the last three months of the war the Confederate dollar would scarcely have purchased our ordinary postage stamp.³ The constantly fluctuating value of the Southern currency disqualifies the figures set forth in the Confederate statements for use at their face value by the careful student. It is not until the figures have been made to represent some standard measure, either of value or quantity, that they acquire significance and can be used scientifically. To have meaning for the historical student, the financial reports require conversion into some constant unit of value.

¹ *American Annual Cyclopædia* (New York), 1864, p. 194.

² *Senate Reports of Committees*, 42 Cong., 2 sess., no. 41, p. 215. These figures do not agree with those cited by J. C. Schwab, *The Confederate States of America* (New York, 1901), p. 76. The discrepancy is explained by the exclusion of the payments on the public debt in the latter statement.

³ *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*, July 8, 1865, p. 41; Schwab, app. I.

The selection of the unit into which the Confederate figures are to be converted is a matter of prime importance. For the purpose of comparison, it is desirable to choose some unit in which other important statistics are given. This is complicated by the fact that the important statistics in which we are interested are not recorded in the same unit of value. For example, the pre-war dollar used in the census of 1860 was a specie standard, whereas the statements of Federal expenses during the war were made in a greenback currency which fluctuated in value. It is apparent that no single conversion of the Confederate financial statements into any one unit of value will yield figures which can be employed in all comparisons.

In the gold dollar we have a standard by which the values of other currencies are rated. It is reasonably stable, and is our most generally accepted unit of value. The available indexes of the value of other currencies in relation to gold facilitate the conversion of both Confederate and Federal statistics into their gold equivalents. These indexes show that the value of the Confederate currency fluctuated almost daily.⁴ This fact makes it clear that refined accuracy would require a day-by-day conversion of the Confederate expenditures into a gold equivalent. To effect this would require daily reports from the Treasury and impose a wearisome task of computation almost too great for one's time or patience. However, the fact that the materials are not available for such a detailed conversion has spared us time, labor, and patience.

Another plan of conversion has been followed. Each semiannual report of the Confederate treasurer was reduced to its gold equivalent, and the sum of these reductions has been used as the gold value of the Confederate expenditure. The average value of currency for each six-months' period was used in making the computation. As an illustration of method, an example may be of interest. We find that the average monthly valuations of gold in Confederate currency from April to October, 1863, were as follows: April, \$4.15; May, \$5.50; June, \$7; July, \$9; August, \$12; and September, \$12.⁵ The addition of these figures and the division of their sum by six produces an average value for the six months of \$8.30 in Confederate currency. Accordingly, the Confederate figures for that period were divided by 8.3 to obtain their gold equivalent. This method, accordingly, gives an equivalent gold value based upon the monthly average value of gold and weighted according to the amount of expenditures in each semiannual report of the treasurer. In so far

⁴ See note 3.

⁵ Schwab, app. I.

as those reports are incomplete, they have been supplemented by correlative statistics from other sources. Of course, there is no contention that the results attained are completely accurate. However, in dealing with large sums, the human perception does not make distinctions and reckonings with mathematical exactitude. Consequently, the discrepancies which occur do not alter appreciably the value of our comparisons.

It is the purpose of this study to examine and recast Confederate financial data in the hope that new light may be shed not only upon the relative efforts of the two warring sections, but also upon the social and economic conditions existing at the close of the conflict. For this purpose the statements of Confederate expenditure are better suited than the statements of revenue.⁶ This is evident for the simple reason that the revenue system, by the autumn of 1864, had broken down completely, whereas the expenditures for war continued until the following April. The deficiencies in official statements of expenditures are supplemented by use of the unpaid requisitions of the War Department. Together they furnish a fairly complete record of war effort.⁷

To October, 1864, the total expenditures of the Confederacy were \$2,126,319,817.⁸ More than half a billion dollars of this amount represents payments upon the public debt, and consequently does not stand for actual war effort but is only duplication of previous expenditures. To obtain the real expenditure, it must be subtracted from the above total. Such deduction leaves a real expenditure for the Confederacy of \$1,532,728,607 in currency. Although this seems a trifling sum in comparison to modern war costs, it reduces to a gold equivalent of only one-third that amount, or \$509,532,700.⁹

Statistics for the last six months of the war are yet to be added. Because of the lack of Treasury Department reports, other figures must be supplied. It is also necessary to make sure that all obligations contracted prior to October, 1864, had been met and were included in the figures of that date. The unmet obligations contracted previous to October, 1864, and the war expenditures in the period following appear to constitute separate problems, but the War De-

⁶ Schwab gives a complete compilation of reports of both revenue and expenditure, but he makes no attempt to deal with the problem of inflation.

⁷ *Official Records, War of the Rebellion*, fourth ser., III. 1094, 1151.

⁸ H. D. Caper, *Life and Times of C. G. Memminger* (Richmond, 1893), "Treasurers' Reports", pp. 432, 438, 457, 477.

⁹ This figure was computed from the statements of the treasurer and the weighted average of gold derived from the quotations given in Schwab, app. I.

partment, our chief source of statistics, has totalled its unpaid requisitions for the whole period of the war. This not only simplifies the problem, but makes impossible a dual treatment. Thus the figures supplied by the War Department cover previous omissions as well as fill the void left by the Treasury Department statistics.

The requisitions of the department to January, 1865, surpassed by 380 millions of dollars the expenditures accredited to it in the last report of the treasurer.¹⁰ On February 18, 1865, Secretary Breckinridge stated that the unpaid requisitions of his department exceeded 230 millions of dollars and that the estimated arrears beyond the requisitions were more than 200 millions in addition, and "These estimates are under rather than over".¹¹ Although the army was considerably reduced, the expenses of the War Department during the remaining six weeks of the conflict could not have been below 50 millions of dollars. Including this estimate, the deficiency for the War Department totalled 480 millions of dollars. The civil and naval departments likewise require consideration. It is unlikely that the costs of these departments declined during the last six months of the war.¹² When one takes into account the previous reports and the changed conditions, 20 millions of dollars seems a conservative estimate for these two departments during the last half-year of the struggle. Collections of these costs and estimates give, in round numbers, half a billion dollars to add to the reports of the Confederate treasurer.

It may be objected that since these requisitions were neither honored by the treasurer nor paid by the Confederacy, they should not be considered a part of the cost of the war. This leads one to inquire what is included in the cost of a war to a belligerent. In general it will include all those burdens falling upon the populations which make up the parties to the struggle. The unpaid requisitions and arrears were due to the people in the South. Like the official debt of the Confederacy, they were not paid, but they stand as a record of obligations and a statement of loss to the social wealth of the South. Adding the costs for the last months of the war to the Confederate financial statements, and deducting the payments upon

¹⁰ *Official Records*, fourth ser., III. 1094, 1151.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, III. 1094.

¹² In fact the expenditures of these departments had increased for the period of the last biennial report to 26 millions of dollars from a previous cost of 16 millions for a similar period. The Confederate navy was very materially reduced after the autumn of 1864, but the increased salaries of officials absorbed this saving. See Caper, p. 475; Schwab, pp. 181-182.

the public debt, produces an expenditure of \$2,032,728,607. This had a gold value of \$522,032,700.

There are other important items which were not included in these statements. The Confederate government levied a tax in kind consisting of one-tenth of certain agricultural products.¹³ The collections from this source were not entered in the financial reports, but were reported in quantities of products by the assistant quartermaster-general and were evaluated at \$150,000,000.¹⁴ This tax was often collected directly by the army under provision of General Order number 48 (1864).¹⁵

The Southern cause also received many gifts from its patriotic supporters. These were usually made directly to members of the army.¹⁶ It is not likely that they would aggregate any great sum, although they probably added greatly to the army morale. A more important saving accrued to the Confederacy through the custom of troopers furnishing their own horses. The government, however, chose to pay for those killed in battle.¹⁷

The state governments, very active in initiating the war, assumed considerable financial obligations for its conduct. This was especially true in the early months of the struggle. At its conclusion, they repudiated debts amounting to approximately 67 millions of dollars.¹⁸ As these debts were contracted early in the war, money

¹³ *Statutes at Large of Confederate States*, acts of Apr. 24, 1863, and of Feb. 17, 1864.

¹⁴ *Official Records*, fourth ser., III. 801-802.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, II. 521, 692, III. 572.

¹⁶ Schwab, pp. 6-7.

¹⁷ *Official Records*, fourth ser., II. 120, 392, 393.

¹⁸ The report of a subcommittee of the committee on reconstruction gave the sum of these debts as \$89,567,000, but I have been unable to discover the source of their data. See *Senate Reports of Committees*, 42 Cong., 2 sess., no. 41, p. 213.

The figures available showed the amount of debt contracted in aid of rebellion as follows:

State	Amount repudiated
Alabama	\$13,094,732
Arkansas	No debt
Florida	Amount unavailable
Georgia	18,153,775
Louisiana	Amount unavailable
Mississippi	16,301,581
North Carolina	14,836,325
South Carolina	2,722,315
Tennessee	5,791,000
Texas	No debt
Virginia	6,000,000
Total	\$66,907,000

These figures were compiled from state documents, the *Annual Cyclopaedia*, and the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*.

had depreciated but little, and their gold value exceeded 40 millions of dollars.

We have now examined the chief statistical items which represent the efforts of the South in the war; namely, the state expenditures, the valuation of the supplies from the tax in kind, and the expenditures of the Confederacy. These give a grand total of \$2,249,728,607, which represents in currency the complete war effort of the South.¹⁹ When reduced to its gold equivalent of \$572,232,700, this sum seems much less stupendous. It is evident that the gold value of the Southern expenditures is little more than one-fourth of its face amount; and if the state expenditures are eliminated, the inflation is even more pronounced, the gold value being only 24.5 per cent. of the face amount.

The entire interest and activity of the South were concentrated upon the war. Of the total expenditures of the Confederacy, more than 96 per cent. were accredited to the War and Navy departments, and 90 per cent. to the Department of War alone.²⁰ The civil departments were little more than administrative and clerical forces for the army and navy.

With the gold value of the Southern war expenditure at hand, it would seem to be a simple problem to derive the portion of Southern wealth that was expended upon the struggle. Before this is done, one should examine the statistics of wealth. The census reports contain statements of assessed valuation and true valuation as reported by the United States marshals. In the earlier reports, the latter statements have the disadvantage of being made in totals and are difficult of analysis, whereas the assessed valuation is broken up into a number of items.²¹ Were it not for this point one might willingly ignore the assessed valuation. The supervisor of the census in 1870 criticized the amount reported in the census of 1860 as twenty to thirty

¹⁹ A summary table may clarify the above discussion of method as well as indicate the sources for the statement of Southern expenditures:

Item	Confederate money	Converted at—	Gold equivalent
a. Confederate expenditure to October, 1864, less payment on public debt	\$1,532,728,607	Various averages	\$509,532,700
b. Unpaid requisitions	500,000,000	2 1-2 cts.	12,500,000
c. Collections in kind	150,000,000	6 2-3 cts.	10,000,000
d. State debts in aid of rebellion	67,000,000	60 cts.	40,200,000
Total	\$2,249,728,607		\$572,232,700

²⁰ *Official Records*, fourth ser., III. 392-393, 531, 532.

²¹ Slaves are given as a separate item in the true valuation as printed in *Senate Reports*, 42 Cong., 2 sess., no. 41, p. 243.

per cent. too low.²² The "true valuation" of 1870 for the whole country was more than double that of 1860.²³ This increase can be accounted for, in a large measure, by the inflation of the currency and rise in prices due to both inflation and speculative mania. The two censuses were taken under the same law and the reporters were required to furnish similar data.²⁴ It should be noted that in both reports the difference between assessed and true valuation was larger for the North than for the South.²⁵

According to the census of 1860, the assessed valuation of Southern property was \$4,363,030,374, and the corrections made by the United States marshals, who were responsible for the collection of the data, placed the true valuation at \$5,202,166,107. Of the latter figure, \$1,751,369,500 represented slaves evaluated at \$500 each.²⁶ The desirability of retaining this amount in the statement of Southern wealth is open to question. Wealth invested in slaves represented human beings, and, in fact, the Proclamation of Emancipation and the legislation which followed it removed slaves from the economic category of property. While nothing physical was destroyed by emancipation, legally the value of chattels and freehold in the South was reduced by one-third. The North had no item corresponding to slaves in its enumeration of wealth. Therefore, for fairness in comparison, it should be stricken from the statements of Southern wealth.²⁷

When one considers the portion of Southern wealth that was spent upon the war, he is at once led to restrict his conception to the portion of consumable wealth. For how, it may be asked, could land in large quantities be consumed by war? This point is all the more pertinent when it is recalled that both sides had more than an abundance of land, whereas there was a wide disparity in their industrial equipment and surplus of products. Nevertheless, the census classification of property into real and personal does not produce

²² *Ninth Census*, III. 8.

²³ The value of slaves was deducted from the valuation of 1860. See *Ninth Census*, III. 8.

²⁴ C. D. Wright and W. C. Hunt, *History and Growth of the United States Census* (Washington, 1904), p. 52.

²⁵ In 1860 the assessed valuation of wealth in the South was 84 per cent. of the true valuation, whereas in the North it was 70.5 per cent. Ten years later the ratio was 77 per cent. for the South and 45 per cent. for the North.

²⁶ *Ninth Census*, III. 9; *Senate Reports*, 42 Cong., 2 sess., no. 41, p. 243.

²⁷ Slaves were certainly a productive factor. However, treating them as wealth pads the Southern valuation and weakens its value for comparative purposes. They should not be counted as both capital and labor, and we here choose to count them as labor.

a division into consumable and non-consumable wealth. The improvements on real estate are, in a measure, consumable, while much that is classed as personal goods is not consumable.²⁸ War consumption, to a large degree, is dependent upon current production, and this will depend upon wealth and labor supply. The true wealth of the South in 1860, exclusive of slaves, was \$3,450,796,607. The gold value of the Confederate war expenditure was 16.5 per cent. of the 1860 valuation. This portion represents positive war effort and takes no account of the losses sustained from other causes.

The decline in value of Southern property exceeded by far the amount of the war expenditures. In greenback currency, the assessed valuation of all Southern wealth, in 1865, was placed at 1603 million dollars.²⁹ Throughout the year the value of the greenback in gold varied from 46 cents to 74 cents, and for nine months of the period it approximated 70 cents.³⁰ The war expenditure of the Confederate States was approximately 55 per cent. of their wealth in 1865. In 1870, the true Southern wealth was given at 2735 millions of dollars, and the exchange on greenbacks was 85 to 90 cents.³¹ Thus the war expenditure was about 25 per cent. of the valuation of 1870.

However, it was the personal property of the South which was reduced most by the war. The assessed valuation of personal property in the South in 1865 was given as approximately 300 millions of dollars.³² Strangely enough this is almost equal to the difference between the valuation of personal property in 1860 and the war expenditure. The statements, however, are in different currencies, and the war cost does not constitute a mathematical explanation of relation between pre-war and post-war wealth. The value of personal property remaining in 1865 was approximately one-third of the war expenditure and one-fourth of the value of personal property in 1860.

The wealth of the North in 1860 was assessed at 7680 millions, and the true valuation was placed at 10,957 millions of dollars.³³ The war expenditures in greenback currency slightly exceeded 3 bil-

²⁸ The census reports include securities in their statements of personal property. In trying to locate economic strength there is some point in including them. Although they do not represent tangible assets they indicate financial control.

²⁹ *Senate Reports*, 42 Cong., 2 sess., no. 41, pp. 214-215.

³⁰ D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States* (New York, 1903), p. 293.

³¹ *Ninth Census*, III. 10; *Senate Reports*, 42 Cong., 2 sess., no. 41, p. 226.

³² *Senate Reports*, 42 Cong., 2 sess., no. 41, pp. 102-209.

³³ *Ninth Census*, III. 10.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXX.—19.

lions of dollars.³⁴ The gold equivalent of this amount approximated two billions of dollars, which was 18.4 per cent. of the Northern wealth in 1860. In 1870, the wealth of the North had increased to 26,280 millions, despite the burdens of the war.³⁵ Thus, as Lincoln pointed out, the increase in population and wealth in the North had exceeded the losses of the war, and the Federal government was in position to continue the struggle indefinitely.³⁶ In fact, the Federal cost of the war was only approximately 9 per cent. of the Northern valuation in 1870.³⁷

Direct comparison of the two antagonists requires the adjustment and equalization of certain factors in the financial records which differ in the two sections. In the first place, the proportion of the government expenditure which stands for war effort varies in the two sections and must be ascertained for each; secondly, the fluctuations in currency values must be adjusted; and finally, the proportion of the expenditure to which the depreciated value of the currency should be applied must be taken into account. All of these factors require careful consideration in order to make the financial statements of value as a measure of war effort.

As previously noted, the entire government expenditure of the Confederacy was devoted to war effort.³⁸ This was not true of the Federal expenditures. For the latter only the War and Navy departments' expenditures can be considered war effort, and even the statements of these departments contain costs of administrative and scientific bureaus which have no immediate relation to the war.³⁹ However, the costs of these bureaus are comparatively insignificant and may very well counterbalance the cost of the civil administration of the Confederacy. We accordingly assume that the statements of expenditures of these two departments represent the war effort of the North. The total cost of the War and Navy departments to the Federal government from June, 1861, to July, 1865, was 3026 millions of dollars.⁴⁰

³⁴ Dewey, p. 329. War expenditures of the Union as here used include the costs of only the War and Navy departments.

³⁵ *Ninth Census*, III. 10, "true valuation".

³⁶ Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, IV. 253.

³⁷ This takes into account, in both statements, the depreciation of the currency.

See Dewey, p. 293.

³⁸ Caper, p. 432.

³⁹ *House Ex. Docs.*, 1129, no. 36; 1187, no. 8; 1195, no. 84; 1229, no. 73; 1267, no. 150.

⁴⁰ Dewey, p. 329.

The Northern expenditure is stated in greenback currency. It would be simple enough to convert it into a pre-war gold standard, but one prefers to leave it unmolested, because students are familiar with these figures, and because the greenback currency was the unit of value and the medium of commerce in the post-war period.⁴¹ The alternative is to convert the Confederate statements into equivalent greenback values. By computation one finds that the average gold purchasing power of the Northern dollar utilized for war purposes was 66 cents or 66 per cent. of the pre-war dollar.⁴² The Confederate gold expenditure may accordingly be converted into an equivalent greenback value by dividing it by sixty-six one-hundredths ($\frac{66}{100}$).

Before making this computation, one is led to inquire whether or not it is desirable to convert the entire Confederate expenditure in order to obtain the best measure of war effort. There may be certain items of expense for which the face value of the expenditure is a better measure of effort than converted gold or greenback equivalent. If the prices of certain commodities or the costs of services did not advance in approximately inverse ratio to the depreciation of the currency, the gold standard is not a reliable measure of effort. For costs which remain approximately stationary, the face value of the expenditure is a more accurate measure of effort than is any standard which takes account of the depreciation of the medium of exchange.

The itemized reports of the Confederate War Department show the major items of expense to have been the payment of the army, the purchase of supplies and ordnance, and payment for transportation.⁴³ How nearly did the changes in prices of these items reflect the depreciation of the currency? Price indexes for the period, showing monthly average prices of important commodities, indicate that changes in value of currency were accompanied by inverse changes in prices of commodities.⁴⁴ This would indicate that the gold value of the Confederate expenditures would be a fair expression of their purchasing power as applied to supplies, ordnance, and transportation. The expenditures for military services constitute

⁴¹ *Review of Economic Statistics*, July, 1920; Dewey, p. 375.

⁴² Statistics used are taken from the *Finance Reports of the United States*, 1861, p. 30; 1862, p. 31; 1863, p. 28; 1864, p. 31; 1865, p. 43; Dewey, pp. 293, 329.

⁴³ *Official Records*, fourth ser., I. 812, 1045, II. 120, 392, 393, 531, 532.

⁴⁴ The table which follows, on page 292, is indicative of the relation between the value of currency and the price of commodities during the war.

an exception to this principle and require separate consideration.⁴⁵ The monthly wage of the Confederate soldier, fixed at \$11 by act of March 6, 1861, was increased to \$18 in June, 1864.⁴⁶ Private's pay in the Union army was \$13 per month until June, 1864, when it was increased to \$16.⁴⁷ Both armies were paid in the regular currencies of their respective governments. Accordingly the depreciation of the currencies did not affect their purchasing power as far as payment of the armies was concerned, and the portion of the currency thus spent retained its face value. Since the expenditures are to constitute a measure of effort, one must recognize the superior purchasing power in military services of the Confederate currency over the Northern greenback. The fact is that the Confederate dollar, prior to June, 1864, secured 17 per cent. more military services than did the Federal dollar during the same period. After June, 1864, the advantage was reversed, being slightly in favor of the Federal dollar. To equalize this difference in army pay, the Confederate expenditures utilized in payment of the army should be increased by 15 per cent.

The proportion of the expenditures of the Confederate Department of War used in payment of the army varied in different reports, and a number of them do not report army pay as a separate item. In the reports of January, June, and December, 1863, the pay of the army constituted 62 per cent., 51 per cent., and 39 per cent., respectively, of the total expenditures of the War Department.⁴⁸ It would seem that at least 45 per cent. of the Southern war expenditures were used to pay its army. This would amount to 1010 millions of dollars in Confederate currency, and if we add its 15 per

The figures indicate the ratio of the average price for the month to the monthly average for 1860, considered as 1.

	1861		1862		1863		1864		1865
	Mar.	Aug.	Jan.	July	Jan.	July	Jan.	July	Jan.
\$1 gold	1.	1.1	1.2	1.5	3.	9.	21.	20.	53.
Cereals	1.	1.	1.3	2.2	4.5	7.6	13.	29.	40.
Meat products	1.1	1.4	2.1	3.3*	5.5	11.	26.	42.	63.
Sugar and molasses ..	1.3	.9	1.6	4. *	11.	27.	47.	114.	157.
Candles	1.	.9	2.1	6.9	10.	19.	25.	36.	54.
Nails	1.4	1.	1.9	3.4	15.	31.	50.	75.	91.
Cotton	1.	.9	1.	.9*	2.3	3.6	15.*	15.	21.

Figures marked with an asterisk are for adjacent months, because those for months indicated are not available. See Schwab, app. I.

⁴⁵ Here we have an example of the operation of the economic law that changes in wages follow (in this case slowly) the changes in prices of commodities.

⁴⁶ *Statutes at Large of the Conf. St.*, act of June 9, 1864.

⁴⁷ *U. S. Statutes at Large*, act of June 20, 1864.

⁴⁸ *Official Records*, fourth ser., I. 812, 1045, II. 120, 392, 531.

cent. superior purchasing power over the Federal currency, it is increased to 1151 millions of dollars.⁴⁹

The remaining 55 per cent. of the Confederate expenditures were used chiefly in the purchase of supplies. The change in the price of these commodities is registered, more or less accurately, by the depreciation of the currency.⁵⁰ Accordingly, the gold equivalent of the expenditures for commodities is the best measure of their purchasing power. These 55 per cent. had a gold value of 312 millions of dollars and had an exchange value equal to 472 millions in war-time greenbacks.⁵¹ The sum of the expenditures for services and of the expenditures for commodities by the Confederacy is 1623 millions of dollars. This figure represents the amount of Northern war-time greenback currency which would have purchased an amount of services and supplies equal to those utilized by the Confederacy. Hence we have an economic statement of Southern war effort in terms of Northern war units and can compare statements of the two sections directly.

The preparation of statements of Federal expenditure is much less difficult. Since we are using the Federal war unit, the only problem is the segregation of the portion of the expenditures which may rightly be termed war effort. It is assumed that only those accredited to the War and Navy departments fall into this class. The expenditures for these two departments during the four years from June, 1861, to July, 1865, were 3026 millions of dollars. The figure derived for the South (1623 millions) is 53 per cent. of this amount. This comparison represents in a quantitative way the relative war efforts of the two sections.⁵²

We have already examined the relation of the gold cost of the war to the value of property in the two sections in 1860. These comparisons throw some light on the portion of the initial wealth of the antagonists which was consumed in the struggle. In the light

⁴⁹ These figures include the total expenditures of the Confederacy plus the expenditures of the states upon the war. It is assumed that the state expenditures were for the same objects and in approximately similar proportions as were the Confederate expenditures. See note 19.

⁵⁰ See note 44.

⁵¹ The method here used is similar to that used in converting currency into a gold equivalent.

⁵² No account has been taken of the varying costs of maintaining the two armies due to the different standards of living provided by their respective governments. This factor defies calculation and yet it is certain that during the later months of the war the provisioning varied. The fare in the Southern army was reduced to the barest necessities.

of the relative efforts of the rival sections, additional comparisons of war costs with total wealth, both prior and subsequent to the war, are of interest to the student of social and economic conditions in that period.

The wealth of the North in 1860 was more than three times as great as that of the South, exclusive of the slaves.⁵³ However, it was noted that the economic efforts of the latter were 53 per cent. of those of its antagonist. It follows that the Confederate war effort in relation to its initial wealth (1860) was more than 50 per cent. in excess of the Federal war effort in relation to its initial wealth. This comparison in no measure indicates the relative economic strain and hardship sustained by the peoples of the two sections. The components in the above comparison are based upon a relation between expenditure and wealth. But it must be borne in mind that the valuations of wealth constantly varied, and varied in opposite directions in the two sections. The value of Southern property constantly decreased throughout the period of the war, whereas the value of Northern property constantly increased. In 1866 the assessed valuation of Northern property was six times as great as the valuation of Southern property.⁵⁴ The census report of 1870 contains statements of both the assessed and the true valuation of property. The former statistics show Southern property to be one-sixth as valuable as that of the North, whereas the true valuation places it at only one-tenth.⁵⁵ If one takes the relation between war expenditure and property which remained at the close of the struggle, the proportion of effort to wealth is four times as great for the South as for the North.

It is of interest to compare the per capita war expenditure of the two sections. This at once raises the problem of including or excluding the negroes who were slaves in the figures used for the calculation. They were a part of the labor force of the South, and many of them remained upon the plantations contributing to the production which supplied the Southern armies. And yet it must be recalled that they owned no property which could bear the burden of war taxation; they were useless as laborers unless supervised; they did not fill the ranks of the Southern armies, but were more frequently found in the enemy's lines. Immediately after liberation and before they became adjusted to their new economic, social, and

⁵³ West Virginia is counted with the North and assumed to have had the same valuation in 1860 as it had in 1870. *Ninth Census*, III. 10.

⁵⁴ *Senate Reports*, 42 Cong., 2 sess., no. 41, pp. 102-208, 214, 238.

⁵⁵ *Ninth Census*, III. 10.

political position in society, they were an economic liability rather than an asset to their communities, and promoters who made investments dependent upon negro labor for their returns usually lost their capital.⁵⁶

It appears from the above considerations that the former slaves were an asset, but certainly not equal contributors with the free population to the support of the war. To count half of them in computing the per capita cost would, therefore, constitute a fair compromise.

One finds that the expense of the war in the South was sustained by a free population of 5,600,594 and 3,502,739 slaves. Counting only one-half of the latter class, this gives a per capita distribution of \$218 in Northern war-time greenback currency.⁵⁷ In the North the population was nearly three times as numerous, and the average cost to each individual was reduced to only \$140.⁵⁸

At first thought, this per capita distribution of costs appears sound. One would expect the Northern people to carry the burden of their efforts in the struggle, and the South to bear its own expenditures. This was not the case. The conquered South was required to repudiate its debts, and thereby lost even the credit assets for the wealth that it had put into the war. The North, on the other hand, carried a large part of its military expense as war debt, and the defeated South was made liable for its part of the payments.⁵⁹ Even the direct tax on land levied by the Federal government during the first year of the war was collected from the South after the struggle was concluded.⁶⁰ To get the true per capita apportionment of the Federal war expenses requires the division of them among the population of the entire nation. This makes a Federal expenditure for the entire country of \$109 per capita.⁶¹

Although the North did not impose upon its conquered enemy a formal war indemnity or exact from the South reparations for the losses of non-combatants, the Federal war debt remained to be liquidated, and pensions for Union soldiers were soon provided. These

⁵⁶ H. G. Pearson, *Life of John A. Andrew* (2 vols., Boston, 1904), II. 269, 314-315.

⁵⁷ *Eighth Census*, I. 598.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ *Finance Report*, 1865, 1866.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, "Report of the Collector of Internal Revenue", 1865, pp. 86-90; 1867, p. 287. See also the reports for 1868-1872.

⁶¹ This figure is based upon the census of 1860.

made a total cost to the nation of between eight and ten billions of dollars.⁶²

It would be difficult to estimate the amount of the Federal war expense later paid by the South. The constitutional provision that direct taxes must be levied in proportion to population of the various states and the unequal taxation of wealth by a protective tariff probably made the Southern portion of the Federal cost of the war exceed its portion of the national wealth.⁶³ The author's judgment on the matter would place the minimum payment of the Federal expenditure for war and pensions by the South at a billion dollars.⁶⁴ This sum is no less than the German indemnity against France in 1870. It was collected from a population only one-third as numerous and whose condition was much more impoverished. Since this was a civil war, such an exaction would not be termed an indemnity, but the lack of a name did not alter its economic effect.

When one adds the Federal war debt to the Confederate expenditure, the per capita cost of the war becomes three times as great for the Southern people as for those of the North. This has added significance when it is realized that the average per capita wealth in the North in 1870 was \$419, whereas in the South it was only \$213.⁶⁵ It is not to be assumed that from the reduced per capita wealth a threefold per capita war debt was to be collected. Instead, the lower per capita wealth in the South is explained by the fact that the

⁶² The Federal debt June 30, 1865, was \$2,682,593,026, and all of this except \$17,613,620 had been created during the war. *Finance Report*, 1860, p. 21; 1865, p. 18. The United States paid to its military pensioners in the fifty years 1870-1920, \$5,713,000,000. The bulk of this expense resulted from the Civil War. The above figures do not include the interest upon the public debt or the cost of administering the pension system.

⁶³ We have no statistics which show the distribution of the federal tax burden, for with a system of indirect taxation there is little probability that goods will be consumed within the district in which they are taxed. Productivity indicates roughly the consumptive capacity of a people and in turn would indicate the relative division of indirect taxes. Thus the portion of the national production which comes from the seceded states is of interest. In 1870 the census returns accredited 12 per cent. of the value of all products of manufactures and farm products to those states. In 1880 the same states produced 10.5 per cent. of the national output of these items. In 1900 their portion was again 12 per cent., and in 1910, including the products from mines, their portion was 13 per cent. *Tenth Census*, II. xiii-xv, III. 4, 11; *Thirteenth Census*, V. 330, 531, 545, VIII. 57, 60, XI. 22.

⁶⁴ The seceded states paid approximately 10 per cent. of the internal revenue in 1880. Their portion in 1922 was about 8 per cent. They would pay a larger portion of the collections from customs duties. *Finance Report*, 1880, p. 110; 1922, pp. 504-505.

⁶⁵ These amounts were worked out from the figures contained in the *Ninth Census*.

Confederate portion of the war burden had already been exacted. The Southern war debt had operated as a capital levy. The debt had been created by forced loans; the Southern people had contributed their goods and services and had received in return Confederate paper. When the Confederacy collapsed its credit became worthless, and the people who held it were the losers. Although the Confederacy became only a memory, the poverty of the people stood as a permanent reminder of their losses. The credit assets which were lost constitute in a sense only fictitious wealth, and yet for many purposes they would have been accepted as real wealth. Consequently their destruction had important economic and social effects.

The fiscal transactions of the struggle are only a partial explanation of the economic problems of the South in the period following the war. The destruction of property, the losses due to depreciation and neglect, the estrangement and distrust of former creditors living outside of the section, the changed social system, and a new agricultural system were all complicating factors in a catastrophe of national magnitude. Society rests upon the base of its social wealth. Its well-being depends in large measure upon the adequacy of its base. The wearing away of social wealth by the struggle and the destruction of credit assets by the conditions of its termination are not conspicuous processes of the struggle, but they are facts of first importance in the history of the succeeding generation.

This study has attempted to bring together the fiscal statements of the Confederacy into a reliable totality, convert them into such units of value as to make them usable, point out by a few comparisons their significance as a measure of effort, and call attention to the contrasted effect of their incidence in the two sections. However limited in its scope, the study seems basic to any discussion which might attempt to show with any degree of scientific accuracy the economic results of the struggle or which would deal with the economic and social problems of reconstruction in a scientific fashion.

JAMES L. SELLERS.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

THE LATER CAREER OF CORONADO

OUR knowledge of Francisco Vázquez de Coronado's expedition is fairly complete. We know very little, however, about the life of this pioneer into our American Southwest before and after his formidable *conquistador* march into the north. George Parker Winship, who wrote the standard account of the *entrada* (*The Coronado Expedition, 1540-1542*, in the *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, Washington, 1896), exhausted most of the printed material on the subject and nothing new has appeared since.

In the course of certain investigations in the Archivo General de Indias two years ago the writer became interested in Coronado and attempted to supplement Mr. Winship's findings. Good fortune attended the research in the form of a number of hitherto unknown documents which in some measure shed light on the darkness that surrounds the explorer. In addition to this material, a search of the acts of the town council of Mexico¹ revealed an unexploited mass of information, as he served in that body in the capacity of *regidor* down to the time of his death in 1554.

For the years leading up to the northern march little beyond matters of detail was uncovered. These details are of value, however, in that they correct the accepted narrative in some points and clear up a few problems in chronology. Coronado apparently entered New Spain with the viceroy Mendoza and was one of the gentlemen in his train when he was accorded a triumphal entry into Mexico City in November, 1535.² Early evidence of the viceroy's favor is manifest in Coronado's acceptance at Mendoza's request by the town council of Mexico City as a *regidor*, in the meeting of June 14, 1538, without a royal provision for the office.³ At this time he is mentioned as being already a citizen of the city, although a search through the preceding meetings does not reveal a record of his ap-

¹ *Actas de Cabildo del Ayuntamiento de Mexico*, ed. Manuel Orozco y Berra with continuations (Mexico, 1859).

² Coronado states in 1547, ". . . este testigo vino a esta nueva españa con el dicho visorrey". A. G. I., Justicia, 48-1-9/31, "Probanza del Virrey, testigo de francisco vazquez de Coronado", Mexico, Jan. 18, 1547, Pregunta 16.

³ *Actas de Cabildo*, libro 4, 131. The usual method was to present a royal *cédula* for an office made vacant by the death or resignation of some *regidor*. The date of citizenship, it will be noted, is two months earlier than that previously found.

plication and acceptance. The royal provision sanctioning this appointment did not reach the *cabildo* until October 13, 1539, and is dated at Toledo, March 21, 1539.⁴ After this meeting Coronado makes no further appearances until October 13, 1542, being occupied with his governorship over New Galicia and his expedition.⁵ In August of 1538, Coronado was cited as governor of that province and acted as such in the fall of 1538, although the confirmation of his appointment was not signed in Spain until April 18, 1539. Some doubt is cast on this latter date by a hitherto unused letter of Coronado to the king, dated from New Galicia December 15, 1538, which states that the viceroy had given him a royal order to go there as governor and judge of residence over his predecessor, the licentiate De la Torre. The letter concludes with an account of his labors as governor up to that point.⁶ While not conclusive, this new evidence would seem to establish a royal appointment to the governorship in 1538, probably placed in his hands in October of that year. This appears to be more reasonable than to suppose that he filled the office and wrote to the king of "a royal order" on the mere strength of the viceroy's nomination.

The period following Coronado's return yielded a richer harvest of new information. First, the complete papers of the secret *residencia* of Coronado as governor of New Galicia, in which office he continued after 1542, were discovered. This item comprises two bulky manuscript volumes (containing charges, testimony, and sentences and filling five hundred folio sheets), product of the labors of Lorenzo de Tejada, *oidor* of the audiencia of New Spain, as judge of residence in New Galicia from August 8 to the end of September, 1544.⁷ Second, the report of Tejada to the king concerning the trial in a letter dated Mexico City, March 12, 1545;⁸ and, lastly, the testimony of Coronado, in the trial of the viceroy by the visitor

⁴ *Actas de Cabildo*, libro 4, 181.

⁵ Winship's surmise that he probably spent the winter of 1538-1539 in New Galicia is borne out by the minutes of the biweekly meetings, which show an absence from Mexico City from Oct. 15, 1538, to Aug. 18, 1539.

⁶ " . . . El visorey me dio una provision real de S. M^{dad} por la qual Su Mag^t me manda venir a esta provincia de la nueva Galicia a tener cargo della y a tomar rresidencia al Lic^{do} de la Torre juez de residencia q̄ aqui fué. . . ." A. G. I., Estado, 66-5-14. Letter of Coronado to the King, Guadalajara, Dec. 15, 1538.

⁷ A. G. I., Justicia, 48-3-3/30, "Residencia que el Lic^{do} Lorenzo de Tejada oydor de la Audiencia R^l de la Nueva España tomo a Fran^{co} Vasquez de Coronado, Governador que fue de la Nueva Galicia".

⁸ A. G. I., Estado, 58-5-8, Letter of the *oidor* Lorenzo de Tejada to the King, Mexico, Mar. 12, 1545.

Tello de Sandoval, in Mexico City, January 18, 1547, containing his replies to the 303 questions on the conduct of the affairs of New Spain, were brought to light.⁹ In addition to these larger items some lesser details were gleaned which, with the unbroken record of the town council, enable us to rescue Coronado from oblivion in his last years, as we can follow his career down to his death in 1554.

This new evidence enables us to tell the following story of Coronado's final days. In 1542 he returned to his governorship over New Galicia, where, at one time, we find him spending forty days in Purificación to the great disgust of the citizens as his horses and servants consumed food at the rate of a gold *peso* a day.¹⁰ A considerable portion of his time was also spent in Mexico City, his faithful lieutenant-governor, Cristóbal de Oñate, attending to the government of the province during these interludes. His rule, if the record of his trial is trustworthy, was arbitrary and marked by numerous acts of cruelty to the native element.¹¹

The year 1544 brought Coronado serious trouble and disgrace. In accordance with royal orders and Spanish custom Lorenzo de Tejada, *oidor* of the audiencia of Mexico, came to Guadalajara and proclaimed a general *residencia* on August 8, 1544. While all official acts were being subjected to a rigid examination, Coronado and his subordinates were deprived of their wands of office by Tejada pending the outcome of his mission.¹² Coronado's was destined never to be returned, for the testimony against him was amazingly incriminating. Toward the close of the month, after visits to other parts of the province and the examination of numerous witnesses, the visitor filed thirty-four charges against him and called on Coronado to reply within a week. The accusations included general neglect of duty while in office, rank favoritism, and numerous ir-

⁹ A. G. I., Justicia, 48-1-9/31, "Provanza del Virrey de la Nueva España don Antonio de Mendoza. Testigo de Francisco Vasquez de Coronado". Mexico, Jan. 18, 1547.

¹⁰ ". . . q̄ en quarenta dias q̄ se tubo en la purificacion el año proximo pasado de quarenta y tres recibio de los bezinos de la d'ha villa toda la comida y bastimio q̄ fue menester todo el d'ho t'po para su persona criados e caballos q̄ en cada un dia valga un peso de oro comun gracioso y sin pagar porello cosa alguna. . . ." Cargo 33, of "Cargos de la Residencia secreta q̄ resultan contra Francisco Vasquez de Coronado", Guadalajara, Sept. 15, 1544, in the Coronado *residencia* cited above.

¹¹ "Ynterrogatorio y t'º de las residencias q̄ se tomaron contra el governador Francisco Vasquez y su theniente Xpobal de Oñate", Guadalajara, Aug. 10 to Sept. 5, 1544, in the Coronado *residencia* cited above.

¹² Tejada's *provision* was signed in Valladolid by Prince Philip, Sept. 7, 1543, and provided that his expenses at the rate of two *ducados* a day for a period of 60 days be paid by the treasurer of New Galicia.

regularities, each duly supported by specific cases. The crimes of which he was considered guilty ranged from setting a bad example by openly dicing and gambling,¹³ through the acceptance of bribes of horses and jewelry,¹⁴ to short accounts¹⁵ and inhuman treatment of large groups of Indians, men, women, and children forced to labor in his mines and on his ranches without pay, proper food, or shelter.¹⁶

Coronado filed his answer immediately, denying a number of the charges, but on the whole made so many damaging admissions that it constituted a confession of guilt.¹⁷ On September 17, Tejada passed judgment on the case and found Coronado guilty of crimes and negligence for which he was condemned to pay a fine of six hundred gold pesos.¹⁸ For his part in oppressing and maltreating the natives in the preparation of his expedition, Tejada jailed him in his own home and passed the imposition of sentence on up to the audiencia.¹⁹ Coronado's holdings of Indians under the *encomienda* system were also examined and found to be in great confusion, with many held fraudulently. The visitor removed these from his control and returned them to the crown.²⁰ Coronado was soon released

¹³ " . . . q muchas vezes y en gran cantidad a jugado a juegos de dados de q ha resultado no buen exemplo en los suditos ni buen despacho en los negocios y pleitos q ante el se trataban. . . ." *Cargo* 26.

¹⁴ *Cargos* 1 to 8, inclusive.

¹⁵ "francisco vazquez se vino a su casa y esta mas para ser gobernado en ella que para gobernar en agena faltanle muchas quilates y esta otro del que solia ser quando vuestra magestad le proveyo de aquella governacion." Letter of Tejada, cited above.

¹⁶ *Pregunta* 22, of the *Ynterrogatorio*; *cargos* 22, 23. Also the Tejada letter cited above states: "andaban en las minas del oro que ay en aquella provincia cantidad de maçeguales y personas libres de los pueblos que particulares tenian encomendados y no pequeño parte sino la principal de los que tenia francisco bazquez de que dios nuestro señor a seido deservido y los naturales harto danificados porque con la meitad destos eran mugeres todas las quadrillas estaban echas un burdel e allende desto que una vez alli entraban jamas se remudaban."

¹⁷ The document is entitled "Descargos", with the comment on the margin, "Confesante".

¹⁸ "Condenose, francisco bazquez por las culpas e negligencias que contra el resultaron en seiscientos pesos de minas. . . ." Letter of Tejada, cited above.

¹⁹ "En lo de la tierra nueva cerca de las crueldades y malos tratamientos que a vuestra magestad informaron aver hecho francisco vazquez y los otros capitanes y soldados tome informacion asi en esta cibdad como en la nueva Galicia i por la culpa que contra el Resulto se encarcelo en su casa da sus descargos y llamarse an los demas culpados questan ausentes y dados se remitira a la audiencia para que lo sentencie como Vuestra magestad por su Real provision lo manda." *Ibid.*

²⁰ "Ansi Mesmo Recebi informacion de los pueblos que nuño de guzman y francisco bazquez de Coronado tenian [en] aquella provincia en los quales halle

on bond and returned to Mexico City to live, where he continued to serve in the town council.²¹ In New Galicia his duties were assumed by an *alcalde mayor*, Baltasar de Gallegos, and the visitor strongly recommended a separate audiencia for the province. His case was apparently appealed to the Council of the Indies, but its ultimate verdict is unknown to the writer. We may infer from the fact that Coronado was never given another important position that the decision of that body was adverse.

The remaining years of Coronado's life were spent in Mexico City attending to the petty round of municipal concerns with occasional visits to his country estates.²² With great regularity he discussed the need of more or fewer wine-shops in the city, the fixing of prices, the repair of streets, and the numerous other problems that vexed the city fathers. At first he quarreled with his fellow members,²³ but as time went on settled into their gait and was even accorded honors²⁴ and rewards²⁵ within their bestowal. In a measure he had recovered his reputation by his assiduity in small things. Was it greater adaptability which enabled one of the epochal ex-

hechas hartas marañas y fraudes como Vuestra magestad podra mandar ver por la informacion que sobre ello se hizo . . . y aquellos Rebocados y dados por ningunos se pusieron en cabeza de vuestra magestad. . . ." *Ibid.*

²¹ He is mentioned in the meeting of that body Dec. 4, 1544, as having been in the city for over two months ("dos meses e mas") without having attended its gatherings, for which negligence he is forbidden its privileges for two months. *Actas de Cabildo*, libro 5, 71. Nevertheless he is in attendance from Jan. 2 to Mar. 5, 1545, and thereafter, following an absence of three weeks, is a fairly constant factor in its deliberations.

²² As, for instance, in 1551 when the meeting of the *cabildo* of Oct. 22 granted him permission to ". . . hir fuera desta cibdad a sus haziendas". *Actas de Cabildo*, libro 5, 36.

²³ On Apr. 27, 1545, he was notified that he must carry the city banner in procession on the day of the *fiesta* commemorative of the capture of the city. *Actas de Cabildo*, libro 5, 89. On May 11 he refused to comply with the order on the grounds of absence from the city on the king's business when his regular turn had come. *Ibid.*, 91. He held out against the command, despite threats of fine and punishment, until July 3, when he submitted. He was so heated in his refusal that the minutes report on June 22, ". . . que no responden a lo demas alegado por el dicho francisco bazquez por que mas parece pacion que sentir ni entender el ni su letrado lo que dize. . . ." *Ibid.*, 95.

²⁴ On Feb. 14, 1549, he was appointed, with Alonso de Merida, to visit the viceroy at Guastepeque, where he was recovering from a severe illness (*Actas de Cabildo*, libro 5, 249), and again July 5, of the same year (*ibid.*, 269). He was absent on this last mission from Nov. 18, 1549, to Feb. 20, 1550, for 28 days of which time he was authorized to receive pay. During his absence, Jan. 1, 1550, he was elected *procurador mayor* of the city and as such erected a pillory in the main plaza.

²⁵ He was granted a piece of land in Tacubaya by the *cabildo* July 17, 1551. *Actas de Cabildo*, libro 6, 27.

plorers of the colonial period to end his days thus tranquilly, or was it that he had at last found a position which suited his capabilities? The scant but pregnant record of his relations with the audiencia and the viceroy tend to confirm one's opinion that the latter is true.

Coronado continued on friendly terms with the administration, as his meetings with the viceroy and instances of his advocacy of its policies in the *cabildo*, too numerous to cite, bear witness. On January 18, 1547, when he testified before a notary public in the case of the viceroy *v.* the visitor general Tello de Sandoval, he made a fine character witness for the former, speaking of him in highest terms both as to character and rule, at a time when enmity on his part could have done Mendoza great harm. In this document he also conducted a vigorous defense of his own expedition as having added extensive new lands to the crown. As the Mendoza administration was under fire at the time and could not afford to have any of its enterprises branded as failures, and as his personal reputation was at stake, his fine enthusiasm on this score must not be accepted as his own private opinion. There is evidence that he convinced the home government, since a royal grant of the services of a number of Indians in *encomienda* was given him November 9, 1549, for meritorious services in discovery and conquest.²⁶ Mendoza, however, had become convinced of Coronado's incapacity, more by his record as governor than by the results of his expedition, and registered his lack of confidence in a communication to the king in 1548, *in re* an application of Coronado for an official position, in which it is explicitly stated that he is not considered to be qualified to fill any government position.²⁷

In 1552 and 1553 Coronado's health gave way and he was forced to leave the capital on two occasions²⁸ in a vain effort to prolong his days. He made his last public appearance in the town council Friday, January 26, 1554, and apparently made a stubborn fight to retain life, as his death is not reported until November 12, 1554, as

²⁶ A. G. I., Consejo, 87-6-2, *oficio y parte* 121, Nov. 29, 1549.

²⁷ Signed by Mendoza as president, and by the audiencia, the opinion states that in their judgment "ni el ni castillo maldonado estar para que se le cometa governacion ni cargos de justicia". A. G. I., Consejo, 58-5-8, "Consulta del Abdiencia de la nueva españa de XX de febrero de 1548".

²⁸ May 20, 1552, he was given a license to leave Mexico City on account of illness and did not return until June 3. On June 5 of the following year, his health made a longer absence necessary and he was a stranger to Mexico City and his duties as *regidor* until Aug. 1, 1553. *Actas de Cabildo*, libro 6, 50-109 *passim*.

a comparatively recent occurrence which, together with another death, absence, and much sickness, hampered the transaction of business.²⁹ Coronado seems to have been unique in the ranks of the early explorers in that he died a natural death in easy circumstances, with an official position, even if a minor one, to salve the disappointment of what was regarded by contemporary New Spain as a great failure—his expedition in search of Cibola.

The conclusions which flow from the foregoing account, as it affects our conception of Coronado's character, are iconoclastic and decidedly at variance with those based on his career up to 1542. They illustrate the danger of naming public monuments after living people, since the hero of to-day may mar his fair record to-morrow. Coronado, as has been supposed, did not voluntarily relinquish his governorship, but was removed from office for very grave offenses which lost him the confidence of his superiors, particularly his patron, the viceroy. Those who, on the grounds of its great accomplishments, praise his acts as leader of his expedition, which ended in near mutiny and disorganization, must pay more attention to what has been regarded as the carping criticism of an embittered old man, Castañeda. Historians looking back on Coronado from the vantage-ground of four centuries must revise their estimates of his ability to command and realize that he was not a great leader nor a great character but merely, through misplaced confidence, the fortunate head of a great pioneering exploit which owed its success to the careful preparation, instruction, and influence of the first great administrator in the New World, Antonio de Mendoza, first viceroy of New Spain.

ARTHUR S. AITON.

THE SOURCE OF FORCE'S TRACT "A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COLONY OF GEORGIA, UNDER GEN. JAMES OGLETHORPE, FEBRUARY 1, 1733"

PETER FORCE's pamphlet with the above title is very well known and frequently cited, but its source is still considered an unsolved problem. Force issued it separately with a title-page imprint: "Washington: Printed by Peter Force. 1835"; then as number 2 of the second volume (1836) of his *Tracts*, where the "Advertisement" to the volume states that "Nos. 2 and 10 have not heretofore been printed", but gives no further information on the subject. It forms also number 2 of the *Transactions of the American Historical Society* (Washington, 1839), presented by Force. It was reprinted

²⁹ *Actas de Cabildo*, libro 6, 152.

in superficial fashion at Rochester, New York, in Humphrey's *American Colonial Tracts*, volume I., number 2, for June, 1897.

The contents of the fifteen-page pamphlet are as follows:

- (1) Brief extracts from the "Proceedings of the Trustees" on July 22 and Sept. 22, 1732.
- (2) "Some Account of the Designs of the Trustees for establishing the Colony of Georgia in America."
- (3) "Arrival of First Colonists, at Charleston, South Carolina, 13 January, 1733."
- (4) "Account of the Progress of the first Colony sent to Georgia."
- (5) "Gen. Oglethorpe's Conference with the Indians."
- (6) "Gen. Oglethorpe's Speech before the Assembly of South Carolina, June 9, 1733."

Now the questions are: (1) Who wrote this interesting pamphlet? and (2) Had it ever been published before Force printed it in 1835?

The late Mr. W. J. DeRenne in his specimen catalogue of 1905¹ records, in quotation marks, that it had been "attributed to Thomas Stephens and Sir R. Everard". Wegelin's 1911 catalogue of the DeRenne Library repeats this statement without the quotation marks.

That the *Some Account of the Designs of the Trustees* had appeared as appendix to Samuel Smith's *Sermon* before the Trustees as printed in London in 1733 is well known. The late Mr. W. J. DeRenne secured (in November, 1911, from Luther S. Livingston) also a very rare previous folio issue of the *Some Account*, etc., alone, evidently issued by the Trustees in 1732, perhaps their first publication in separate form.² But what of the rest of the Force pamphlet?

¹ See *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, II. 73, 85 (June, 1918).

² This copy (four pages, without title-page, and with unsigned decorative head-piece representing a woman dispensing fruits, etc., to two cupids) is remarkable as containing at the foot of p. 4 a Map of South Carolina, Georgia and Florida with an inscription on Florida subsequently erased before the same copperplate was used in Smith's *Sermon*, 1733, and in all three issues of Martyn's *Reasons*, 1733. This fact was discovered by my friend Dr. George Watson Cole when he catalogued this copy in August, 1917, and was incidentally mentioned by me in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, II. 75 ff., 83 (June, 1918). The map in its first state will be reproduced in the new catalogue of the DeRenne Library now being printed. The second state (from Smith's *Sermon*) may be seen in Winsor, V. 365. This map does not appear at all in the otherwise identical British Museum copy (no. 6 in C. 32. l. 1, formerly $\frac{601. m. 17}{6}$) which I examined in October, 1923. The same British Museum volume contains also (item no. 8) another edition of the folio *Some Account* with the map in the later state on another leaf otherwise blank. Above the caption ("Some Account") on p. 1 is an engraved head-piece showing wood-cutters and builders at work in the fore-

T. M. Harris's *Biographical Memorials of Oglethorpe* (Boston, 1841), page 54 n., asserts that the whole tract appeared in volume XLVI., page 234 (*i.e.*, in the number for September, 1733) of a rare and interesting London periodical *The Political State of Great Britain*—for which the Library of Congress printed catalogue card substitutes: "Most of this tract seems to have been copied, with slight verbal changes, from 'Political state of Great Britain,' 1732-1733, v. 44-46"; and I was officially informed that that Library owns no Force or other manuscript of the pamphlet. Jones and Winsor give us no clue, and Sabin (number 27018) says: "Not heretofore published."

However, an examination of the set of *The Political State of Great Britain* in the Columbia University Library³ soon showed that it relied often on Charleston newspapers; and then I noticed in the most useful *Handbook of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress* (1918), page 139, that that Library has a Force folio manuscript of miscellaneous papers 1732-1796 containing, *inter alia*, "Extracts from

ground, landscape and plan of town (Savannah) in background, "J. Pine Inv. et Sculp"^t (from same copperplate used in all three issues of Martyn's *Reasons*, 1733); and at the foot of p. 4 is a tail-piece showing trees, two oxen drawing a car (or plough?) guided by a draped figure carrying a banner (?), "J. Pine De. et Sculp." (from the same copperplate also in all three issues of Martyn's *Reasons*). The same British Museum volume contains further (bound just before the first *Some Account*) a folio title-page (*verso* blank) reading: *Some Account of the Designs of the Trustees for Establishing the Colony of Georgia in America*. London, Printed in the Year MDCCXXXII. Unfortunately, the various items in this volume are so bound that I could not ascertain definitely to which of them this title-page really belongs. But my friend Mr. L. C. Wroth kindly called my attention to the fact that the John Carter Brown Library has copies of both editions, *identical* with those in the British Museum (as proved by my photostats), and that in the copy belonging to the former library the above title-page is very clearly part of the same sheet as the map (second state, on *recto* of its leaf)—which proves conclusively that it belongs to the *later* edition. I have now myself seen this copy at Providence, and suppose that the sheet bearing the four pages of text was intended to be placed between the title-page and the map, rather than after the map-leaf as at present. Since the text of both editions is the same, though re-set (some 44 lines to a full page, instead of 54), either of them may be "the printed paper we sent out to inform the world of our design" mentioned under Nov. 30, 1732, in the recently published *Diary of the president of the Georgia Trustees*, Viscount Percival, afterwards first Earl of Egmont (London, 1920, I. 299), published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission. Unfortunately, he does not say just when it was thus "sent out". Perhaps the first issue was after all merely a trial issue never actually distributed, officially.

³ This set and that in the Library of Congress both lack vol. LV. (for January-June, 1738), which, however, contains nothing on Georgia. I now own vols. XLIV.-LI. (July, 1732-June, 1736) and XXIX. (January-June, 1725). There are only odd volumes at Harvard. There were 60 vols. in all, for 1711-1740; until October, 1729, the editor was Abel Boyer (1667-1729).

the South Carolina Gazette, 1732, relating to the establishment of the Colony" of Georgia. I ordered a complete photostat of this manuscript and then saw at once that this is indeed the long-sought immediate source of the Force pamphlet in question. The Force manuscript gives the *numbers* of the *South Carolina Gazette* in each instance. Their dates, I find, are December 2, 1732, to July 14, 1733, old style. From editorial alterations in the transcript and from slight errors it is evident beyond doubt that this transcript and *not The Political State of Great Britain* is the real direct source for the whole pamphlet, including the *Some Account of the Designs of the Trustees*, which last was therefore not taken by Force from Smith's *Sermon*, either.

The above facts were stated very informally⁴ at the eighty-third annual meeting of the Georgia Historical Society at Savannah, April 12, 1922. Subsequently I compared side by side the Force *Tract*, a photostat of the pages of *The Political State of Great Britain* for September, 1733, a photostat of the Force transcript, and the original newspapers in the Charleston Library. The contents of the *Tract* appeared in the *South Carolina Gazette* as follows:

- (1) Proceedings in S.C.G. no. 47 for Dec. 2-9, 1732.
- (2) Some Account " no. 46 " Nov. 25-Dec. 2, 1732
continued (beginning "Christianity will be extended") in
S.C.G. no. 47 for Dec. 2-9, 1732.
- (3) Arrival " no. 53 " Jan. 13-20, 1732 (*i.e.*,
1733, New Style).
- (4) Account " no. 63 " Mar. 24-31, 1733.
(N.B. This item is in the '*Political State*', Sept., 1733.
- (5) Oglethorpe's Conference S.C.G. no. 72 for May 26-June 2, 1733.
- (6) Oglethorpe's Speech " no. 74 " June 9-16, 1733 (in-
troductory paragraphs only).
(speech). S.C.G. no. 78 " July 7-14, 1733

As compared with the newspapers, the Force transcript is accurate as a whole, the slight variations being quite immaterial, except that the words "and printed copies of the said accounts" are omitted before "will be transmitted" in the transcript and are therefore lacking near the foot of page 5 of the *Tract*; in which further, on page 10, May 1732 (misprint!) should read: May 1733. The *year-date* here as elsewhere was *correctly* added in the transcript when it did not appear in the newspaper in the same place. But a

⁴ Therefore not mentioned in the account of that meeting in the *Ga. Hist. Quar.*, VI. 122. My paper on "Edward Langworthy and the First Attempt to Write a History of Georgia, with Selections from the long-lost Langworthy Papers", there referred to, appeared in the *Ga. Hist. Quar.*, VII. 1-17.

more modern and more scientific editor would have used square brackets for such, and other similar slight editorial alterations, which the transcript clearly shows to have been made subsequently.

LEONARD L. MACKALL.

"PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A SINGLE DAY."

THERE is a persistent tradition that some man, merely by virtue of his being president *pro tempore* of the Senate, became President of the United States for a single day. The *Biographical Congressional Directory, 1774 to 1903*, is explicit as to both the man and the date, declaring: "This office made him [David R. Atchison] President of the United States during Sunday, March 4, 1849, as General Taylor was not sworn into office until the following day."

By the succession act of 1792 it was provided that "in case of removal, death, resignation or inability both of the President and Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate . . . for the time being shall act as President of the United States until the disability be removed or a President shall be elected". In accordance with that law, for nearly a century (1792 to 1886) the president *pro tempore* of the Senate stood next to the Vice-President in the line of succession. Out of the two facts that Atchison was president *pro tempore* of the Senate in March, 1849, and that Taylor did not take the oath of office till the afternoon of Monday, March 5, has arisen this myth of "President" Atchison.

Few words are needed to dispose of any claim for a place for Atchison in the line of presidents. Atchison's term as senator had expired with the ending of the thirtieth Congress, Sunday, March 4. When the Senate was called to order by its Secretary on the morning of Monday, March 5, 1849, the very first motion passed was "that the oath of office be administered by the honorable Thomas H. Benton to the honorable David R. Atchison, *Senator elect* from the State of Missouri; and that he be, and hereby is, chosen President of the Senate *pro tempore*". In other words, during the hours of Sunday afternoon and Monday morning prior to the passing of this vote, neither Atchison nor anyone else was president *pro tempore* of the Senate. That office was vacant.

Did the fact that Taylor had not taken the oath of office till the afternoon of March 5 constitute an "inability" such that, if sudden emergency had arisen on that Sunday afternoon or Monday morning, it would have devolved upon the president *pro tempore* of the

Senate—had there been such an officer at the time—to act as President of the United States? Phrases used by Polk and by many of his contemporaries indicate that they would have answered, "Yes".

In his *Diary*,¹ Polk records that on the evening of March 3 he went to the Capitol believing that his term would end at midnight. There he was waited upon by many senators, representatives, and members of his Cabinet, who emphasized the provision of the Constitution that the President shall hold office for four years, and who argued that, as he had not taken the oath until between 12 and 1 o'clock on the fourth of March, 1845, his term could not end until the same hour on the fourth of March, 1849. Persuaded by them that this was the correct view, although many members of Congress and some of his Cabinet were still insistent that he should retire at midnight,² the President continued to sign bills at the Capitol till nearly three o'clock, and he affixed his signature to two important bills which were brought to his lodgings at about six o'clock, Sunday morning. Of this he wrote: "Thus closed my official duties as President of the United States."

Under date of March 4, Polk wrote in his *Diary*: "Having closed my official term as President of the U. S. at 6½ O'Clock this morning, that being about the time at which Congress adjourned, I attended Divine Service."³ On March 3, 4, or 5 he made no mention of Atchison, as of course he would have done, had there been any suggestion of the duties of the office having devolved upon the Missouri senator. But in the entry of March 5 Polk mentioned "Gen'l Taylor, the President elect of the United States". Five times he referred to him as "Gen'l Taylor"; not until after the oath was

¹ Vol. IV., p. 367.

² There continued to be doubt in Congress as to when its own term expired. Two years later, Mar. 3, 1851, the Senate was in session at midnight. Thereupon several senators expressed the belief that the term of the Congress had expired, and that, inasmuch as, in their opinion, their terms had expired, they had no right further to participate in the proceedings. When roll-calls were ordered, they therefore refused to vote. Lewis Cass and James M. Mason were among those who held that the term of Congress had expired. Jefferson Davis, expressing doubt as to his competence to serve, advanced toward the chair, asking to be sworn in as a member of the *new* Congress, by virtue of his re-election. After an interesting debate, in which many members took part, unanimous consent was given to the consideration of the following resolution, introduced by Senator Yulee: "*Resolved*: That in the opinion of the Senate, the present Congress does not expire by constitutional limitation until meridian of the 4th of March." Passed by a vote of 29 to 19, this solved the problem of the moment and established the precedent for the future. *Cong. Globe*, Mar. 3, 1851, p. 820; *Senate Journal*, p. 261; U. S. Senate Rules and Manual, 1923, p. 113.

³ *Diary*, IV. 372.

administered did he formally change the phrase to "Gen'l, now President, Taylor".⁴

In the official programme of Inauguration Day, signed by the three members of the Committee of Arrangements of the Senate, mention was made of "General Zachary Taylor, the President Elect", and twice of "the President Elect". The *Congressional Globe* of March 5 recorded: "At half-past twelve o'clock, the President elect, Gen. Zachary Taylor, supported by the Ex-President, the Hon. James K. Polk, entered."⁵ At that moment was there no *President*?

It is clear that neither Polk himself nor the Senate Committee on Arrangements, nor the compiler of the *Congressional Globe*, nor the writers for the daily papers—the *Daily National Intelligencer* and the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* have been consulted—regarded Polk as President after 1 p. m., March 4, at the latest. Yet every one of them took pains to refer to General Taylor as "the President-Elect" until he had actually taken the oath. But in mentioning Taylor's entrance to the Senate chamber, the *Journal of the Senate* used more discriminating language. It referred to Taylor as "the President of the United States" at that moment, and added: "the Senate proceeded, accompanied by them, to the eastern portico, where the *President of the United States* delivered the following address", at the conclusion of which "the oath of office was then administered to the *President of the United States*".⁶

Hon. Charles Warren, the historian of the Supreme Court, has recently called attention to the Constitution's requirement that the prescribed oath or affirmation be taken "before he enter upon the execution of his office", *not* "before he shall become President". Under the theory that a President-elect does not become President till he takes the oath of office, says Mr. Warren, "Zachary Taylor, taking the oath on March 5, 1849, would not become President until that date. He would, however, under the peremptory provisions of the Constitution—'He shall hold his office during the term of four years'—then have been entitled to hold office until March 5, 1853. Such a possible result is, of course, quite out of the question".⁷

GEORGE H. HAYNES.

⁴ *Diary*, IV. 375.

⁵ P. 326.

⁶ *Senate Journal*, Mar. 5, 1849, p. 354.

⁷ Letter to the writer, May 31, 1924.

DOCUMENTS

FROM THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON, 1856-1867

THE manuscript autobiography of Herschel V. Johnson, of which about a third is printed here, is in the possession of a member of the Johnson family in Atlanta, Georgia, Mrs. Tomlinson F. Johnson, sr. For the opportunity to print the portion of it most likely to interest our readers we are indebted both to the possessor and to Professor Percy S. Flippin of Mercer University. The portions not here published, extending from the writer's birth to the end (1857) of his period as governor of Georgia, are well worthy of print, but concern the history of Georgia rather than the general history of the United States. They are an interesting record of a life marked by energy, public spirit, and intelligent devotion to duty, and of a character which won widespread and lasting respect for integrity, moderation, and good feeling. The public fame of Governor Johnson, however, now rests chiefly upon his having been a candidate for the vice-presidency on the ticket with Douglas in 1860, on his having been in the crisis of the ensuing winter a Union man, consistently opposed to secession, and on that moderate course during the period of the Confederacy which in 1865 and 1866 made him an important force in carrying Georgia through the earlier stages of restoration to the Union. It is accordingly these portions of the autobiography, extending from 1856 and 1857 to the time when it was written, late in 1867, that have been chosen for presentation to the readers of the *Review*.

The earlier portions of the autobiography record that Herschel V. Johnson was born on September 18, 1812, "within about three miles of Farmer's Bridge, across Brier Creek, in the piney woods of Burke County, State of Georgia", son of Moses and Nancy Johnson, of Revolutionary stock. He was well taught in neighborhood schools, till at the age of fourteen he entered Mangham Academy near Warrenton. There he studied nearly two years, and there and elsewhere was prepared for the University of Georgia, which he entered in 1831 and from which he was graduated in 1834. Howell Cobb and Henry L. Benning were classmates, and Alexander H. Stephens, in a neighboring class, an intimate friend. Having also studied law meantime, he was admitted to the bar in the autumn of 1834, practised in Augusta till 1838, at Louisville till 1844, and afterward at

Milledgeville. Always a Democrat, he took an active part in political speaking from 1840 on, was a presidential elector for Polk in 1844 and for Pierce in 1852, and a delegate to the Democratic nominating conventions of 1848 and 1852. By appointment from the governor of Georgia he served in the United States Senate from February 14, 1848, to March 4, 1849. From 1849 to 1853 he was a judge of the superior court for the Ocmulgee circuit. He was governor of Georgia from November 9, 1853, to November 6, 1857. He seems to have been an excellent governor.

Governor Johnson's political creed in respect to slavery was marked by a firm advocacy of what in the 'fifties was called "non-intervention". In the factional contests of Georgia he adhered to the States'-Rights party. In religion he was a Swedenborgian. He took great interest in literary and educational matters, wrote well, and in public speech abounded in the florid eloquence which was then so highly regarded but has now become old-fashioned. He preserved his speeches with care, and gathered as many of them as possible into the systematic "Collections" which are so often referred to in the text which follows, and which were intended to accompany the autobiography as *pièces justificatives*. This collection is now in the hands of Hon. J. K. Hines of the Supreme Court of Georgia, who served under Governor Johnson in earlier days. A life of Johnson, by a biographer selected by Judge Hines, is likely to appear within the next two years.

IN 1856, while the Buchanan canvass was pending, Gov. Wise of Virginia invited the Governors of the Southern States to meet in Raleigh, North Carolina, to concert a proper line of action to be adopted, in the event of Fremont's election.¹ He evidently contemplated resistance in some form. I declined to respond to the call on the ground, first, that I had no authority to act in the premises; second, that Georgia in 1850 had laid down her position and that as her Executive, I would do nothing, looking to sesession, unless the Congress of the United States should pass some act in contravention of the Compromise measures. I have not a copy of my letter to Governor Wise.

This is also perhaps an appropriate place to note that, while I was yet in the Executive office, I received a very flattering vote in the National Democratic Convention, held in Cincinnati in June, 1856, as the nominee for the Vice President of the United States, on the ticket with Mr. Buchanan.² But perhaps fortunately for me, Mr. Jno. E. Ward, having been elected to the Presidency of the Convention, it was thought Georgia was sufficiently honored, and Hon. Jno. C. Breckenridge re-

¹ See B. H. Wise, *Life of Henry A. Wise*, pp. 209-210.

² On the first ballot, 59 votes were given to John A. Quitman, 55 to John C. Breckinridge, 33 to Linn Boyd, 31 each to Governor Johnson and James A. Bayard, and lesser numbers to others. On the second ballot, Breckinridge was nominated.

ceived the nomination. I say fortunately, because if I had been nominated, how can I say it would not have turned my brain, as it did his, and caused me to commit his blunder of joining in the "Charleston rupture".

IX.

At the close of Executive service—the beginning of the Legislature, 1857—it was expected that the General Assembly would elect a Senator to succeed the Hon. Alfred Iverson, whose term would expire on the 4th of March, 1860.³ Indeed, the subject was seriously canvassed during the session. But as another meeting of the Legislature would intervene before the end of his term, it was finally decided not to go into the election. My name was favourably mentioned in connection with that high position. I was a candidate, in the event of an election, and I think I should probably have been elected. (For a few of the articles in the news papers, urging my election, *Vid.* "*Miscellaneous Scraps*", in this *Collection* etc.)

In December, 1857, I retired to private life, on my plantation in Jefferson County, called *Sandy Grove*, where I now reside, with but little desire and less expectation of mingling again in political affairs. I had been an active participant, ever since 1840, in the stirring arena of politics. I was weary of its turmoil, its perils to reputation, its asperities and heart-burnings and therefore the repose of the country and rural pursuits was sweet. But the time for another Presidential election hastened apace. The Republican party, early in the spring,⁴ had nominated its candidate. Abraham Lincoln was already in the field, bearing the black banner of hostility to the institutions of the South. The National Democratic Convention met in Charleston early in May. The platform of principles, which Mr. Lincoln represented, wrought the Southern mind to a pitch of intense excitement and furnished men of disunion tendencies with a pretext for a bold effort to execute their long cherished [design] to "precipitate the cotton States into revolution". Availing himself of it, at the head of the Alabama delegation, Wm. L. Yancey went into the Convention, instructed to demand that the Convention should insert into the platform of the principles of the Democratic party of the Union, a new feature, to wit; that it was the duty of Congress to protect Slavery in the territories. The excuse for this demand was found in the Dred Scott decision. He was a man of great eloquence, as a popular declaimer; the theme was one which he had mastered thoroughly and the Southern portion of his audience were already highly aroused. It is not strange, therefore, that he swayed them as the Storm does the billows of the Ocean. Besides this, it was clear that Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois was the choice of a decided majority of the Convention. Mr. Buchanan had quarreled with him, upon the Lecompton constitution of Kansas; he had persecuted and hunted him down; leading members of his Cabinet and their followers had joined in the odious work of crushing that noble man and able Statesman. They had their instruments, representatives and sympathizers in the Convention. In addition to this there were other aspirants for the nomination—Southern men—who

³ At this time, under the Georgia constitution and its amendments, Governor Johnson's second term would end early in November, 1857. The term of Senator Iverson ended Mar. 4, 1861.

⁴ Of 1860.

thought the election of Douglas would post-pone indefinitely the realization of their dreams of ambition. They too had their friends in the Convention, to urge their nomination, if possible, and to defeat that of Douglas at all hazards. These are the elements of excitement—already glowing with red heat—on which Mr. Yancey could operate. He had the sagacity to discern and use his opportunity and with matchless skill he wielded almost all the Southern delegation. They united with the Alabama members, in the demand for Congressional protection to Slavery in the territories and in the resolve to withdraw, if the demand should be refused. It was refused, and the withdrawal took place. In some instances entire delegations, and in every instance, a part, thus introducing schism and leaving the body composed mainly of the representatives of the Northern and Western States. Under these circumstances, the Convention adjourned to meet in Baltimore on the 18th day of June. The “Bolters” determined on a separate convention to be held in Richmond, Va. As was natural, the popular excitement was tensified. It was not confined to the Southern States. It extended over the Union, indicating unmistakably that the formation of two Sectional parties would be the inevitable result. The question arose, whether it was the duty and policy of the Democracy of this State to approve and sustain the course of the seceders, or appoint new delegates to supply their seats in the Convention at Baltimore. I had during my whole public career adhered to the fortunes of that great party. As far back as 1848, I had committed myself to the policy of “non-intervention”. I had, in good faith, acceded to the “Georgia Platform” of 1850,⁵ which placed my native State on the principle of non-intervention, upon the peril of disunion, should Congress violate it. I had seen for years, that the only hope of the Union, was in the integrity and ascendancy of the National Democracy. After the surrender of California, I saw there was nothing left worth struggling for, so far as slave territory was concerned. And I had become satisfied that Slavery was safer in than out of the Union. In addition to all this, I knew that Douglas was our true friend; that he was honest, bold and wise. He had my sympathy in the war waged against him by unprincipled demagogues and Presidential aspirants. Therefore, I could not sanction and approve the conduct of that portion of the Georgia delegates who had withdrawn from the Convention at Charleston. I knew that the overthrow of the National Democracy was the prelude to disunion and that disunion promised nothing but unmixed evil to the South. In my seclusion, a letter came to me from Messrs. Robert Collins and others, of Macon, asking for my views touching the crisis and the true policy of the Democracy of Georgia. My response is dated May 10th, 1860, and presents an elaborate consideration of the subject, in all its bearings, according with the remarks above made. (*Vide Collection, etc.*) That letter at once placed me again in the political arena. I did not obey the call reluctantly; for I was much concerned and thought I descried the signs of the brewing tempest. It subjected me to severe criticism and animadversion on the part of some of my cherished friends. The Albany Patriot was especially pointed and drew from me a reply to its fire, in which I adhered to and vindicated the position of my Macon letter. (*Vid. Collection, etc.*)

⁵ Adopted almost unanimously by the special state convention held in December, 1850. Text in Ames, *State Documents on Federal Relations*, pp. 271-272.

A Democratic Convention, in accordance with a previous call, was held, in Milledgeville on the 4th of June, to consider the proper course to be pursued.⁶ It was a large Convention, there being more than a hundred counties represented. It was also imposing for the amount of talent it embraced. It was a great occasion—one that stirred the popular mind to its profoundest depths; for perhaps the destiny of the Union hung upon its deliberations. On motion of the Hon. Wm. H. Stiles,⁷ a committee of three from each Congressional District was appointed to report business for the action of the Convention. I was appointed one of the three from the 8th District. I felt confident from the material of the Committee that a very large majority would be in favor of sustaining the course of the Bolters, adhering to the demand for Congressional protection and appointing delegates to the Richmond Convention. When we met for consultation, my apprehension was realised. I found myself in a minority of four against twenty four. They resolved to report as I expected; the minority, consisting of Thomas P. Saffold, H. K. McCay, A. Colvard⁸ and myself, brought in a Counter Report. (*Vid. Collection, etc. for both reports.*) It was written by me. When they were read to the Convention, the excitement was intense. Their relative merits elicited a protracted, animated and very able debate. It was participated in by John A. Jones of Muscogee, Judge John Jones of Paulding, Hon. James L. Seward of Thomas,⁹ Hon. Hiram Warner of Merriwether,¹⁰ Hon. Henry R. Jackson of Chatham,¹¹ Wm. H. Stiles of Cass, James Gardner of Richmond,¹² Hon. Howell Cobb (then Sec. of the Treasury) of Clark and myself, from Jefferson. My speech on that occasion was not reported fully. A very correct synopsis will be found in this *Collection etc.* It does not become me to say much of this effort. But my friends and those opposed to me on the question, said I was eloquent and able—that it was the greatest speech of my life. All I can say is that I felt that I was master of the subject and recognized, in the countenances of the members, the evidences that they felt the force of my argument. But the majority report was adopted by great odds and in accordance with its recommendation, appointed the same delegates (including the bolters) to the Richmond Convention and also to the Baltimore Convention, “believing” (as the resolution expressed it) “that whole delegation would be willing to carry out” the principles embodied therein. Those who agreed with me, some fifty, protested, withdrew, and on the same evening held a Convention of National

⁶ See Toombs to Stephens, June 9, 1860, and Stephens to J. H. Smith, June 17, in Am. Hist. Assoc., *Annual Report*, 1911, II. 481-482.

⁷ M. C. 1843-1845, chargé d'affaires in Austria 1845-1849, colonel C. S. A., author of *Austria in 1848-49*.

⁸ Coward? Saffold was a Georgian of some prominence in politics, McCay a lawyer, who was born in Pennsylvania, but had lived in Georgia since 1839. After the war he was a judge of the Georgia supreme court.

⁹ M. C. 1853-1859.

¹⁰ Judge of the supreme court of Georgia 1845-1853, chief justice 1872-1880, M. C. 1855-1857. He is characterized in Fielder's *Life and Times of Joseph E. Brown*, p. 87.

¹¹ Judge in Georgia, chargé d'affaires and minister resident in Austria 1853-1858, brigadier-general C. S. A., minister to Mexico 1885. See Fielder, p. 66.

¹² Editor of the *Augusta Constitutionalist*. Fielder, p. 86.

Democrats, in contradiction to sectional disunion Convention, which the majority had shown itself to be. Hon. Hiram Warner was chosen President; a committee of thirteen was appointed to report the names of four delegates for the State at large and sixteen from the eight Congressional Districts, to represent the National Democratic party of the State in the Baltimore Convention. I was appointed as one of the delegates for the State at large. B. Y. Martin, Esq., of Muscogee, offered for the consideration of the Convention the Resolution reported by the minority of the Committee of the Convention from which we had seceded which were unanimously passed. A Committee was also appointed to prepare an Address to the Democratic Party of Georgia. James A. Nesbit, Esq.,¹³ Nathan Bass, Esq.,¹⁴ and myself composed that committee. I was chairman and wrote the Address. (*For these proceedings and the address, Vid. Collection, etc.*) These are painful reminiscences. I can never forget the sorrow and sadness which they produced in my mind. They presaged the events of the then threatening future.

Before the meeting of the Baltimore Convention, the road to Baltimore, via Richmond, was almost, if not totally abandoned, by the disruptionists and both sets of delegates from Georgia, appointed by the two conventions, as before stated, met in the Monumental city, both claiming admission. After tedious delay and patient examination, the seceding delegates from Georgia were recognised and those of us who were appointed as National Democrats were rejected. Louisiana and Alabama also appointed, as did the minority Convention of Georgia, National Democratic delegations, in lieu of the "bolting delegates". Whilst [ours] were rejected, those of Alabama and Louisiana were admitted. I never precisely understood the reason which induced this discrimination against the National Democratic delegates from Georgia. I think, however, the Conventions of Louisiana and Alabama were more formal in their call and more time allowed to obtain the true sentiments of those whom they represented. Whereas that of Georgia was impromptu—no formal call made—no time for having the true National Democracy of the State represented. Another consideration had its influence. The delegates from Louisiana and Alabama were openly in favor of the nomination of Mr. Douglas, while we of Georgia declined to commit ourselves, being really desirous to have the Hon. A. H. Stephens, as the standard bearer of the Party. We had no objection to Douglas per se, but felt that it was due to the party and the best interest of the Country for him not to be urged. We had hope that the name of Mr. Stephens would restore harmony and that by his nomination, the bolters might possibly be induced to waive their demand for Congressional protection of Slavery in the territories. But we very soon found that it would produce no such result. For even the bolters, especially from Georgia, seemed to fear that he might be nominated and thus weaken their power for schism and sectionalism. Some of them were his warm personal friends—but unfortunately they would have been delighted to be nominated themselves and seemed to prefer discord, rather than peace, by the nomination of anybody else. Now let it be born in mind that, in every instance, the bolting delegates were returned by the respective States which they represented. They were returned with in-

¹³ James A. Nesbit of Macon. See *Georgia Hist. Quarterly*, VI. 368.

¹⁴ For a short time a member of the Provisional Confederate Congress.

structions to insist on the demand which kindled the fires, at Charleston. They were all admitted except those from Louisiana and Alabama. But they all took offence at the decisions of the Convention, in relation to contested [delegations], because the bolters from these two States were rejected. They all withdrew, organized and nominated as their candidates Hon. John C. Breckenridge of Kentucky and Joseph Lane of Oregon. Now two or three questions naturally suggest themselves: first, why did not the seceders remain in Convention, at least until the demand was renewed for Congressional protection? But they retired without any such demand. Secondly, why did they not remain and defeat the nomination of Douglas, since he was so very obnoxious? By the established rule of the Convention, it required two thirds to make a nomination. They constituted more than one third, so that, if they did not have the power to nominate a man of their own choice, they did have the power, if they had remained at their post, to have defeated him forever. Under these circumstances, it is difficult to resist the conviction, that their fixed purpose was to break up the Democratic Party, regardless of consequences.

Their withdrawal still left the Convention composed of an immense majority who proceeded to nominate Stephen A. Douglas for the Presidency and Benjamin Fitzpatrick of Alabama¹⁵ for the Vice Presidency. It was well understood that Mr. Fitzpatrick's friends *desired* his nomination, and it was not doubted that he would accept. The Convention adjourned on the 23d of June. On the 25th, Mr. Fitzpatrick addressed a letter to the appropriate committee informing him of his nomination, in which he declined it. I was still in Baltimore, at the house of my brother-in-law, Col. James Polk.¹⁶ I was telegraphed to go immediately to Washington and that it would be required of me to accept the nomination which Mr. Fitzpatrick had refused. I was taken entirely by surprise—astonished at the turn of events. I was frequently approached in Baltimore, during the session of the Convention, on the subject of being elected as the candidate for the Vice Presidency. I invariably discouraged the idea and refused the use of my name in that connection, for I had not the least desire for the honor. I knew it would be an empty honor, because the rupture of the party rendered its success hopeless. But I went to Washington that same afternoon, when the National Democratic Committee, authorized to act in the premises, tendered me the nomination. Upon mature reflection in full view of responsibilities and consequences, and well satisfied that defeat was inevitable, I accepted it. An extract from the Journal of the Convention containing the proceedings on that occasion and my speech of acceptance will be found in this Collection.

As I was deserted by many life long cherished political friends, abused by the almost entire Southern press, denounced by men of talent and high position from the hustings, and maligned by the entire crew of small politicians that followed the banner of Breckenridge and Lane, I choose to record here very briefly the motives that induced me to abide the for-

¹⁵ Governor of Alabama 1841-1845, U. S. senator 1848-1849, 1853-1861, president of the Alabama constitutional convention of 1865.

¹⁶ Governor Johnson had married, Dec. 19, 1833, Mrs. Ann F. Walker, daughter of William Polk, for twenty years a judge of the superior court of Maryland. Col. James Polk was an attorney in Baltimore.

tunes of the *National Democracy* and its ablest and truest representative men.

Of all the distinguished Northern Democrats, Douglas had been my first choice for the Presidency, since the Convention of 1852, which nominated Pierce. I made his acquaintance in the Senate of the United States in 1848. He was so frank, so brave and bold, so able in Statesmanship and so true to the Constitutional rights of the States, that he challenged my confidence and admiration. True, I did not agree with him in all his political views, but the difference was never such as that I was not willing to trust him. I thought on some points he was wrong in theory; but practically, he grappled with vexed questions, more like a true Statesman than any public man of his day. I was never deceived in him. He never abandoned his position in obedience to clamor. He marched forward in his purposes with a courage that never faltered. Hence, he was very acceptable to me personally.

Again: I knew he was the idol of the great Northwest—destined at no distant day to rule the destiny of the United States. That portion of our country is eminently Agricultural. The South is Agricultural. She was also in a minority—weak without allies. This identity of pursuit between these two sections was a strong source of sympathy, calculated to unite them upon measures of government policy. I desired to strengthen and intensify that sympathy. Douglas was the representative man of the one and the consistent friend of the other, who had always stood by her and she had given unmistakable evidence of confidence in him in the Cincinnati Convention in 1856. Hence, I regarded it as the best policy of the South to rally around Douglas. It would make all his friends of the North—and they were numerous and powerful—our friends and cement an alliance which would control the action of the Government and thus protect us against the aggressions of the North.

Moreover the grand old Democratic party was hoary with honors. It had achieved nearly everything for the Union, which illustrated its greatness and made it to command the respect of all nations. I had been educated in sentiments of admiration and reverence for it. I cordially believed in its political creed. But it was now divided and sought to be slain, in the house of its professed friends. Its fortunes were declining and its glory departing. I could not consent to desert in this dark hour of its extremity. I believed it was right and I determined that it should not go without a candidate for the Vice Presidency, even though defeat was my doom. I thought I should be amply compensated for the sacrifice, if in my humble way, I could be instrumental in part, in preserving a portion of it, North and South—in a state of organization, around which its friends might be rallied again in the future for fresh struggles and fresh victories in the cause of the Constitution and the Union.

Finally, I was satisfied with the doctrine of "Non intervention", as contained in the Platform of 1852 and 1856 and as held by Douglas. The South had agreed to it. By the 4th Resolution of the Georgia "Platform" of 1850, my native State was bound by it. Hence I regarded the action of the bolters as worthy to be characterized as *bad faith* on their part to the Northern Democracy. These are some of the reasons that induced me to incur censure, reproach and contumely in the cause of Douglas and the National Democracy. I must add, that I have never regretted it and I do now (Dec. 24, 1867) firmly believe I was right.

Do subsequent events condemn or sustain me? This is not the place to speak of the subsequent years; but if we could roll back the wheel of time enlightened by their experiences, I suppose, the masses of the people would, like me, *trust to Douglas and the old Democracy*.

On my return home from Washington, the wires having distributed the news of my nomination and acceptance, I witnessed unmistakable evidences of disapproval. I occasionally overheard expressions of scarcely concealed denunciation. At the towns and villages, where the cars would stop, and when it was made known that I was on the train, crowds would gather at the windows to get a glance at the man who dared to stand boldly in opposition to the sectional disunion movement of the Breckenridge democracy. They eyed not as a hero they wished to admire, but as some curious specimen of the genus homo, who deserved the gallows, for alleged treason to the rights of the South, who, as they supposed, had abandoned his friends and his hearthstone, for the poor price of the Vice-Presidency. These things were not pleasant, but they brought no terror to my heart. I was prepared for it all. I knew the spirit of fiery intolerance that animated the seceding hosts. I anticipated the storm of virtuous (?) indignation that would greet me everywhere in the South. But I was clothed in a coat of mail, impenetrable as brass—it was that of conscious rectitude—rectitude of principle, rectitude of policy, rectitude of motive. I resolved to be immovable as granite, trusting to time and events for my vindication. I had sent forward a notice, by Telegraph, that I would address the people of Atlanta on the night of the 28th of June. When I arrived in that city, not a friend greeted me with a smile and those that called on me, called to express their regrets at the fatal step I had taken. They reminded me that I had achieved an enviable popularity by my previous career; that the path of honor and preferment was open to me almost without a peer and without a rival; that they could pardon my opposition to the course of the disruptionists at Charleston; but that having allied myself with Douglas, by accepting a candidacy for the Vice Presidency, on the ticket with him, was fatal to all my future prospects and would not only consign me to obscurity, but to political infamy. One friend, and one who was really a supporter of Douglas, called to warn me against speaking, according to appointment. He said he feared if I attempted it, personal violence would be offered me; for he had heard it threatened openly on the street during that day and the avowal that I should not speak. I heard all with calmness and patience except this. I told him I was an American Citizen and a native Georgian; that my past life was a guarantee of my fidelity and devotion to the welfare of the Union and the rights of the South and that in defiance of all threats, I would speak. My manner was impressive, solemn and firm as death. He quivered under my indignant glance and replied, that he only warned as a friend and having done so, I must take my own course, and the consequences. Said I, "I fear no consequences; no violence will be attempted, for those who threaten openly are generally cowards. They will stand mute in the presence of a man that has the courage to do right—*I will speak*". He accompanied me to the place appointed; a large audience met me—nearly every one of whom was opposed to me and would have condemned me as a traitor to the South. I spoke for two hours. Not a murmur was heard—not a hiss disturbed the hall. The few timid Douglas men came out openly and enemies said of me he is wrong—I am sorry for

it—but he seems to be honest. The following night the 28th I spoke by appointment in Macon. There too I recd. the “cold shoulder” from old friends, but I was sustained by a few men of standing, talent, influence and political experience. I repeated the address which I delivered in Atlanta the previous night. I was occasionally applauded by a few Democrats and the friends of Bell and Everett, who were the candidates of the “American Party”; but evidently the prevailing feeling of the majority of my audience were against me. Once I was hissed but I turned upon the perpetrators of the discourtesy with such a look of scorn and words of burning rebuke, it was not repeated. I was a guest of the Lanier House. The next morning, I was hanging in effigie on the limb of a tree immediately fronting the Hotel. This was the second time in my life that I was crowned with honor by the vulgar and cowardly, the first being the burning in effigie in Monticello,¹⁷ to which I have referred in a former part of this narrative. This act of vandalism made me friends and votes. The community was indignant. They felt that I was a Georgian—had served the State faithfully—that my character was above reproach. Their indignation was outspoken, and the perpetrators hid their diminished heads from the public scorn. I never have transpired [divulged?] ¹⁸ publicly who they were. But I have ascertained. The ring leaders were two—the one a South Carolina fool and the other, a poor drivelling Yankee—*nice man he*, to outrage a Georgian to the manor born, because he opposed the doctrine of Congressional protection of *Slavery* in the territories. Messrs. James T. Nesbit,¹⁹ Nathan Bass, James W. Armstrong²⁰ and others joined in a request for the publication of my speech on that occasion. I furnished them with a copy, which was published and circulated over the State and the Union as a campaign document. (*Vid. Collection, etc.*)

The campaign was now fairly opened. I made several speeches in Georgia—I spoke in Warrenton, Eatonton, Monticello, Waynesborough and Augusta. I cannot speak of them without a display of egotism. Descriptions of them were given by letter writers in the news papers of the day, according to their merit, beyond my own conception of justice. In the meantime a convention was called and an electoral ticket headed by the Hon. Alex. H. Stephens of Taliaferro and Hon. A. R. Wright of Floyd,²¹ for the State at large. Mr. Stephens had retired from public life. He was very averse to the position thrust upon him. He justly entertained no hope of success. He saw political troubles in the future. He foreboded disaster. But his patriotism slumbered not. He wielded his battle axe, with as much zeal and earnestness as if he expected victory. To him and his colleagues I left the work in Georgia. I was summoned by those whom I thought knew what was best, to labor in the North. My first appearance there was at an immense mass meet-

¹⁷ In the spring of 1851, when, as a circuit judge, he had in a charge to the grand jury denounced vigorously the local violators of the law in respect to the carrying of concealed weapons, illicit traffic with slaves, the opening of tippling shops on Sunday, gambling, etc.

¹⁸ Probably the author meant to write “It never has transpired”.

¹⁹ Probably James A. Nisbet is meant.

²⁰ Of Macon.

²¹ M. C. 1857–1859, member of Confederate Congresses, 1861–1864, and colonel C. S. A. See Fielder’s *J. E. Brown*, p. 65.

ing at Jones' Wood in New York.²² There I met Mr. Douglas. To my surprise he indulged some hope of success—many of his friends were sanguine. I did not conceal my entire despondency in private conversation with them. He made a great speech and I made a speech to that vast sea of men, covering as densely as they could be packed an areal of four acres of ground. My speech was so badly reported, owing to the great confusion and the difficulty of being heard. Hence, I did not preserve any copies of it. The curious can see it in the New York papers of that day, such as it is from under the hands of the reporters.

I conversed with Mr. Douglas about the condition of the Country. He was, as usual, frank and outspoken. He thought if he was not elected by the people, Lincoln would not be—nor Breckenridge and that neither of them could be, by the House of Representatives, if the election should be thrown before that body. But I, as frankly, stated my apprehensions to the contrary. I told him he underestimated the power of Mr. Buchanan's army of office holders, in the Northern States; that although they could not carry a single one for Breckenridge, they would bring him enough votes to give them all to Lincoln, that he (Mr. D.) would not carry a single Southern State and that I regarded Lincoln's election as certain. I shall never forget the expression of deep sadness at this announcement. He was silent and thoughtful for a moment, but rallying, said, "If you be correct in your views, then God help our poor Country". Continuing the conversation, he said it was strange to him that the South was so hostile to him—that they had voted for him more than a score of times in the Cincinnati Convention;²³ that he had not, since then, changed his views on Non intervention; that the South had agreed to that, as a permanent basis of adjustment; that he had always been a friend to the South and that in his canvass with Lincoln, in Illinois, for the Senatorship, he had endured threats, detraction and abuse, for his advocacy of the Constitutional rights of the South. Said I Mr. Douglas, the whole thing to my mind is plain. The extreme men of the South see now that they can avail themselves of the hostility of Buchanan and his administration towards you, under the color of States rights, to bring themselves into power or destroy the Union; they are willing to jeopard the latter for the feeble hope of the former. Hence, their appeals to the sectional prejudices of the Southern people. Those prejudices are easily irritated, because badly inflamed, by the avowed policy of the Republican party. They have succeeded in making them believe that, what they call "Squatter Sovereignty", is as bad as abolition, and that your election will therefore, be as fatal as that of Lincoln. Oh, said he, little do they know of my heart. I am no advocate of slavery; but viewing it as a matter belonging to the people and protected by the Constitution, I would never consent for Congress to touch it in any way for any purpose. If I should be elected, I will give repose to the country—no abolitionist should participate in my administration. I should bring around me a new set of men and put the Government on the old Constitutional track. Our conversation was long. I do not pretend to state it all, nor quote his words. But it heightened my admiration of and augmented my confidence in the integrity, wisdom, courage and soundness of the Democratic nominee for the Presidency.

²² Jones's Wood lay between 66th and 75th streets, Third Avenue and the East River. Douglas spoke there on Sept. 12.

²³ There were seventeen ballots.

From New York, I went into various parts of the Northern and North Western States. I must have traveled four thousand miles, addressing immense meetings almost every day. But few of the speeches here were reported, and such as were, very imperfectly. I have been able to preserve two or three speeches and news paper accounts of a few others. On the 17th of September I addressed a vast assemblage in Concert Hall, Philadelphia. On the 28th of September, I made a speech at the mighty meeting at Indianapolis, Indiana; on or about the 23rd of October, I made a speech at Wooster, Ohio, to a vast gathering of the Democracy. It was imperfectly reported in the Wayne County Democrat of the 24th. On the 18th of October, I spoke at Rome, New York. That speech was meagerly reported in the Democratic paper of that town. I was elegantly and hospitably entertained by the Hon. John Stryker.²⁴ I made a speech to a Mass meeting at Chenango, New York, which was reported or rather an account of it given in the Chenango Union of the 24th. I returned to New York City and spoke in the Cooper Institute building on the 24th of October. The speech was pretty well reported in the New York Herald. On my way back to Georgia, I spoke at Richmond, Va., on the 27th of November. It was fully, but not very correctly reported in the Virginia Index. This was the last speech I made during that canvass. They are all included in this collection. (*Vid. Collection, etc.*)

I must indulge in a few reflections. I look back upon my Northern and Western tour with great pleasure. I made many agreeable acquaintances. I was everywhere treated with the highest respect and consideration and entertained with unstinted hospitality. I paid no Hotel bills nor fare on Railroads. In addition to that of Mr. Stryker, I must mention that of Mr. Dodd of Indianapolis,²⁵ and that of the Hon. Arphaxad Loomis,²⁶ at Little Falls, New York. I was accompanied a portion of the time by Mr. J. K. Clinton of Mississippi—a pleasant companion and an eloquent speaker.

Another thing that impressed me was the enthusiasm of the people. I found them as warm blooded as those of the sunny South. It was remarkable what immense gatherings could be had on only three or four days' notice. Less than ten thousand was considered a small meeting and deplored as a failure. Their devotion to the Union was almost idolatry and I came to the conclusion that peaceable secession was out of the question and that war with such a people should be avoided as long as possible. I was not in Georgia when Mr. Douglas visited the State at the close of the campaign. I regretted this, for I desired to join our people in reciprocating the generous hospitality which his friends had extended to me.

The result is known. Douglas and Breckenridge were both defeated and Lincoln was elected.

X.

The announcement of Lincoln's election was the signal for the secession of the Slaveholding States from the Federal Union. The people of the Southern States were intensely exasperated. The friends of the

²⁴ A leading lawyer and bank president of Rome.

²⁵ Perhaps Harrison H. Dodd the printer, afterward Grand Commander of the Sons of Liberty.

²⁶ M. C. 1837-1839.

Union in the North were deeply interested in every development of public sentiment in the South. I recd. many letters, asking for information and for my views. I have been able to preserve but two of my replies,—one to Aug. Belmont of New York, dated November 27th, 1860, the other to John P. Jeffries of Wooster, Ohio, dated December 28th, 1860. (*Vid. Collection, etc.*) They indicate very clearly my hostility to the exercise of the rights of secession, but I had as yet had no special occasion for taking any prominent part in the issue that agitated the public mind. I was quietly, but uneasily, at home. The Legislature was in session. I went to Milledgeville to mingle with the representatives of the people. The excitement was bewildering. All the leaders of the Breckenridge democracy were there—almost without exception—rampant for immediate secession. They were impatient, overbearing, dictatorial and intolerant, could scarcely treat a Douglas man with courtesy—if in addition to his being a Douglas man, he was for the Union, he was scorned. When the Legislature first assembled, the members were wavering, confused, without a plan and almost without a policy. If left to themselves, they would have inclined to a conservative course. But when the Toombses, and Iversons, and Howards and Jones', Bennings, and Cobbs ²⁷ and the men of that stamp, arrived as outside counsellors, the fire was soon kindled. Many of these distinguished men, urged the *Legislature* to take Georgia out of the Union. They were rampant—they could not wait the slow process of referring the question to the people by calling a Convention. They hesitated to trust the people. At one time the General Assembly—or rather a majority—were disposed to heed these rash counsels. But the question was discussed in the Legislature and out of it by able speakers, such as Toombs, Benning, T. R. R. Cobb and Stephens. This last named gentleman spoke the night of November the 14th. It was an able speech, so conciliatory in tone and forcible in argument, that it produced a very salutary effect, and perhaps prevented any formal attempt to take the State out of the Union by Legislative action. On the day after the delivery of this speech, I recd. a note from Messrs. George A. Hall ²⁸ and others, members of the Legislature, in which they said, "having great confidence in my wisdom and patriotism, they most respectfully requested that I would at my earliest convenience address them upon the perilous issue then upon the Country". I replied on the next day, declining to comply with their request; but at the same time giving my views as to the proper course to be pursued. I advised the same line of policy which I did in my letter of the 5th of November, 1850, to James S. Hook and others, when the State was similarly, though not so intensely, excited in relation [to] the "Compromise Measures". After stating that I did not think the mere election of Lincoln was a sufficient cause to justify secession, especially when the South, by her schism, was in part instrumental in occasioning his election, I summed up the course I would advise in the following proposition:

²⁷ The names of Robert Toombs, Alfred Iverson, Howell Cobb, and T. R. R. Cobb need no explanation. The other references are, presumably, to Major Thomas C. Howard and John H. Howard; to John J. Jones, M. C. 1859-1861; and to Henry L. Benning, a judge of the Georgia supreme court 1853-1861, and brigadier-general C. S. A. Jones and Benning are described in Fielder's *Joseph E. Brown*, pp. 57, 61-62.

²⁸ Afterward lieutenant-colonel C. S. A.

1. Let this Legislature call a convention of the people at such time as may be deemed most convenient, to consider and determine what the State should do; and also in the meantime, put the State in a condition to meet any emergency.

2. Let that Convention reaffirm the Georgia Platform and demand the repeal of all laws passed by the non slaveholding States, which obstruct the execution in good faith of the act of Congress, for the rendition of fugitive slaves.

3. Let that Convention appeal to the Northern States, to suppress by all legitimate measures the Slavery agitation, as subversive of the peace and fraternity between the States of this Union.

4. Let that Convention ask a consultation with the other Southern States, either in a Congress for that purpose, or in such other manner as may be best calculated to secure concert of action. (*Vid. Collection, etc., for this correspondence.*)

The result of all these discussions was, the passage of an Act, providing for the call of a State Convention and the election of delegates thereto, to meet on the ——— day of ———, 1861.²⁹

The issue presented for decision by the people in those elections was whether or not the Convention should pass an ordinance of secession. And if decided affirmatively, should the State withdraw immediately and separately or seek the co-operation of the other slaveholding States in the hazardous movement. Of course, I was opposed to se[ce]ssion in any form; but if it must be, I advocated co-operation. The early day fixed by the Legislature for the meeting of the Convention precluded anything like a general canvass of the State. I made but one speech, which was delivered in Louisville, Jefferson County, in which I resided, on the 15th of December, 1860, and designed to influence the vote of that county against secession. How far it was instrumental in accomplishing that object, I cannot say. But the truth is there were only fifty or sixty votes cast in the County for the secession ticket. I was one of the delegates elected to the Convention. (*Vid. Collection, etc., for that speech.*) My opinions and views were also asked by letters received from persons in different parts of the State; my replies, with one exception, have gone to the "tomb of the Capulets". It was written to A. W. Stone, Esq., and published in Handbill form for circulation. It is dated December 20th, 1860. (*Vid. Collection.*) My opinion now is, and always has been, that a fair and energetic canvass would have showed a large majority of the people against the policy of secession. As just remarked, there was no time allowed for discussing the subject upon the hustings; and what speaking there was, was confined almost entirely to the secessionists. They were more than zealous—they were frenzied. They did not, in my judgment, present the issue fairly to the popular mind. They insisted that it would be peaceable—that it would not bring war—that if it should the Yankees were cowards and would not fight—and that, at the worst it would be a short war, in which the South would achieve an easy victory and that we should then have a Southern Confederacy, with a homogeneous population and interests, which would enjoy the friendship of all nations and the admiration of mankind. These were the fancy pictures painted to their followers by the leaders of the Breckenridge seseders. The people were honest, patriotic and confiding, hence, they yielded to the storm cry of secession.

²⁹ Jan. 16, 1861.

trusting that the convention would act wisely and for the best. But, in view of these representations of peace and promises of a sunny career for the Southern Confederacy, the decision could not be fairly claimed as being in favor of secession. If the people had been told, what experienced politicians *ought* to have known, that it would provoke a war for Coercion and that it would probably exceed all previous wars in magnitude, slaughter and desolation—being a family war in which each section would fight for self-preservation—the people, in my humble opinion, would have decided against disunion, by a large majority.

The Convention met on the day fixed by the Legislature. The fiery Spirits were there as delegates. They were defiant, wrathful, overbearing, dictatorial; but withal, they exhibited the firmness of deliberate purpose, not without the dignity of talent combined with great eloquence and personal worth. I reached Milledgeville on the day previous to that fixed for the assembling of the Convention. Dr. Means,³⁰ Judge Warner, Mr. B. H. Hill,³¹ the two Stephens³² and myself were probably the most prominent men elected as delegates opposed to secession. I had corresponded with Mr. Stephens, before the meeting of the Convention; we agreed in our general views; I expected him to be our leader. Hence, I had prepared nothing for the consideration of the Convention, looking to him to do so. As soon as I reached the seat of Government, I sought an interview with him and I was surprised to find he had not written a word; I urged upon him the propriety of his doing so and told him we looked to him to designate the line of policy which the Union delegates should pursue and to take the lead in its advocacy. He declined to occupy that position, or to prepare anything for the Convention, but urged me to do so and that he would sustain me. We compared views. Mr. Hill and Dr. Means also approached me and expressed their anxiety on the subject and spoke of the awkwardness of our position, if we went into the Convention, in opposition to secession, without some definite programme of our own around which to rally. I therefore prepared the following preamble and resolutions,³³ which I showed to each of those gentlemen, including T. W. Wofford of Cass County,³⁴ who approved them cordially.

The Convention met on Wednesday, January the 16th, 1861. On Thursday, Mr. Nisbet of Bibb³⁵ offered the following Resolutions on which the proceedings thence following were had:

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Convention, it is the right and duty of Georgia to secede from the present Union and to co-operate with such of the other States as have or shall do the same, for the pur-

³⁰ Dr. Alexander Means, professor of chemistry in the Atlanta Medical College.

³¹ Senator in the Confederate Congress, M. C. 1875-1877, U. S. senator 1877-1881.

³² Alexander H. Stephens and his brother Linton.

³³ The preamble and resolutions here mentioned are not copied into the manuscript at this point, but may be found in the *Journal of the Convention*, pp. 15-20, or *Confederate Records of Ga.*, I. 230-235.

³⁴ Meaning W. T. Wofford, afterward brigadier-general C. S. A.

³⁵ Eugenius A. Nisbet of Macon, M. C. 1839-1843, judge of the supreme court of Georgia 1845-1853, member of the Provisional Confederate Congress. See Fielder's *J. E. Brown*, p. 64.

pose of forming a Southern Confederacy upon the basis of the Constitution of the United States.³⁶

My speech was brief but never reported. The above proceedings³⁷ were in secret session. It was entirely extemporaneous and I had never taken the trouble to commit it to writing. Indeed, I spoke under the enervating effects of almost overpowering sadness. I offered my preamble and resolutions as a substitute and that they together with the resolution of the gentleman from Bibb should be referred to the committee which he proposed to raise. An animated, but respectful debate ensued, in which the leading delegates on both sides participated. I made a brief speech, which was never reported. I said in substance, that, though believing in the right of secession, yet, I did not think it was now the duty of Georgia to exercise it; that I believed it was unnecessary; that, if we would be patient and give the conservative element of the North time to organize and act, we might hope for redress and safety in the Union and at all events it was due to the border States, to the magnitude of the occasion and the weighty consideration which should lead us to break up the Union with caution, to make the experiment; that I offered my substitute in no captious spirit, but rather to test the sense of the Convention, whether it was the deliberate purpose of the majority to dissolve the connection of the States with the United States; that if it were not, then my substitute might at least be suggestive of some plan of action which would give time for the "sober second thought" of the people of both sections and that I had a strong hope that such "sober second thought" would bring relief. Mr. Stephens also spoke in favor of my motion and his speech fully solved the mystery in my mind, why he was so disinclined to champion our earnest effort to defeat secession in the Convention. He had come to the conclusion that such effort would be vain and perhaps do more harm than good, since failure was inevitable. His speech amounted to a surrender of the contest before that body. I so regarded it. It was so interpreted by many who heard it. I knew how unpopular I was in the Convention. I had taken sides with Douglas—ran on the ticket with him, without which there would have been no Douglas Electoral Ticket in Georgia. This consideration, connected with my sad disappointment at the despondency of Stephens, overmastered me and I took no further part in attempting to resist secession. I have never conversed with Mr. Stephens in relation to the above interpretation of the tone of feeling which his speech seemed to indicate or of my conjecture as to the reason that he failed to make a zealous fight against secession in the Convention. I am giving my impressions at the time. If they do him injustice, I am certainly innocent of any intention to do so.³⁸

³⁶ *Journal of the Convention*, p. 15, or *Confederate Records of Georgia*, I. 229, resolutions offered by E. A. Nisbet.

³⁷ Meaning, proceedings of the convention, which on Jan. 18, before the introduction of Nisbet's resolutions, resolved that its sessions should be held with closed doors.

³⁸ Stephens's speech is printed in Johnston and Browne's *Life of A. H. Stephens*, pp. 380-382. For the curious history of a forged "speech" of Stephens on this occasion, see Mr. L. L. Mackall's "Notes for Bibliophiles", in the *New York Herald-Tribune: Books* for Nov. 9, 1924. His anticipations respecting the convention, which correspond with Governor Johnson's conjectures, may be seen in his letters to his brother, Jan. 1, 3, 10, *Life*, pp. 374-379.

From the Autobiography of Herschel V. Johnson 327

The Committee of Seventeen consisted of Messrs. Nisbet, Toombs, Herschel V. Johnson, Bartow, A. H. Stephens, Benning, Williams,³⁹ Brown of Marion, Hill of Harris, Hill of Troup, Trippe, Chastain, Cobb, Colquitt, Kenan, Reese. On Saturday, the 19th January, that Committee, through its chairman, Hon. E. A. Nisbet, reported the following ordinance,⁴⁰ on which the following action was had:

An Ordinance

To dissolve the Union between the State of Georgia and other States united with her under a compact of Government entitled "the Constitution of the United States of America".

We, the people of the State of Georgia, in Convention assembled, do declare and ordain, and it is hereby declared and ordained:

That the ordinance adopted by the people of the State of Georgia in Convention on the second day of January in the year of our Lord seventeen hundred and eighty-eight, whereby the Constitution of the United States of America was assented to, ratified and adopted; and also all acts and parts of acts of the General Assembly of this State ratifying and adopting amendments of the said Constitution, are hereby repealed, rescinded and abrogated.

We do further declare and ordain, That the Union now subsisting between the State of Georgia and other States, under the name of the "United States of America", is hereby dissolved, and that the State of Georgia is in the full possession and exercise of all those rights of sovereignty which belong and appertain to a free and independent State.

The report was taken up, and on motion of Mr. Toombs, the ordinance was twice read.

Mr. Hill of Troup⁴¹ moved that the preamble and resolutions offered by Mr. Johnson of Jefferson on yesterday, as a substitute for the resolutions adopted by the Convention raising the committee to report an ordinance to assert the right and fulfill the obligation of the State of Georgia to secede from the Union, be received as a substitute for the same.

On which motion the yeas and nays were demanded.

There are yeas 133; nays 164, to wit, etc.

And so the Rubicon was crossed and the State of Georgia was launched upon a dark, uncertain and dangerous sea. Peals of cannon announced the fact, in token of exultation. The secessionists were jubilant. I never felt so sad before. The clustering glories of the past thronged my memory, but they were darkened by the gathering gloom of the lowering future.

On the 21st of January Mr. Nisbet offered the following preamble and resolution which were taken up and read:⁴²

"Whereas, the lack of unanimity in the action of this Convention, in the passage of the Ordinance of Secession, indicates a difference of opinion amongst the members of the Convention, not so much as to the

³⁹ James Williamson of Telfair. The name of Rice (G. D. Rice of Cobb) has been inadvertently omitted.

⁴⁰ *Journal*, pp. 31-32, or *Confed. Rec. Ga.*, I. 251. The nine lines which here follow the ordinance are quoted from the journal.

⁴¹ B. H. Hill.

⁴² *Journal*, p. 45; *Confed. Rec. Ga.*, I. 269.

rights which Georgia claims, or the wrongs of which she complains, as to the remedy and its application before a resort to other means of redress:

And whereas, it is desirable to give expression to that intention which really exists among all the members of this Convention, to sustain the State in the course of action which she has pronounced to be proper for the occasion, therefore:

Resolved, That all members of this Convention, including those who voted against the said ordinance, as well as those who voted for it, will sign the same as a pledge of the unanimous determination of this Convention to sustain and defend the State, in this her chosen remedy, with all its responsibilities and consequences, without regard to individual approval or disapproval of its adoption."

Mr. Nisbet then moved their adoption, which motion prevailed.

I complied with this resolution by signing the Ordinance of Seseession. It was the act of the Convention without my signature, and it gave it no additional force. If my signature had been necessary to give it validity, I should not have signed it. But according to my political creed, I believed and still believe, that the State of Georgia had the right to secede, although I deplored the policy of exercising it and anticipated the worst of consequences. After seseession became an accomplished fact, it was, to me, the voice of command and obedience, a patriotic duty. To Georgia, in my judgment, I owed primary allegiance. Hence, I signed in order to give the utmost moral weight to the deed, in the trembling hope that it would diminish the chances of war.

Having previously decided to send commissioners to such Slaveholding States as had not already seceded, to communicate the action of Georgia and ask their co-operation, on the 26th of January,⁴³ the Convention by resolution, charged the Committee on Foreign relations with the duty of nominating the same on the 28th, when the Convention would proceed to elect them.⁴⁴ I was solicited to permit my name to be submitted for election, as commissioner to Virginia. Which I declined on the ground, first, that I was opposed to the policy of seseession, and secondly, that I had been recently in the Presidential campaign, which had just transpired, made a speech in Richmond, in which I deprecated seseession and argued that the line of policy urged by the Breckenridge party, led to that result. Said I, "How could I have the face, with that speech fresh in their memory, to urge Virginia to commit the same mistake which Georgia has done?"

I was also urged by friends of the seseession party to be a candidate for the position of Delegate, for the State at Large, to the Montgomery Congress. I declined. When the election took place, I was confined to my room by indisposition and without my knowledge or consent my name was put in nomination. I was told afterwards that I came near being elected and probably would have been if I had been present. I replied, "I would not have been for I should not have been even *voted for*"—meaning thereby that I would have peremptorily refused. The reason for this determination was satisfactory to me. As I was so bitterly opposed to the ordinance of seseession—so averse to a disruption of the Union, I thought it was more becoming in me to stand aside and permit those who

⁴³ *Journal*, p. 77; *Confed. Rec. Ga.*, I. 313.

⁴⁴ *Journal*, pp. 90, 118; *Confed. Rec. Ga.*, I. 330, 367.

had undertaken the work, to complete it; that if failure should come, I should not be to blame, if success (for which I prayed) the secessionists were entitled to the glory.

I took little, or no active part in the proceedings and deliberations of the Convention. I was one of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and endeavored to act wisely; and upon all measures before the Convention, I voted conscientiously, with the view of bringing the best results out of what I considered the most stupendous blunder ever made by rational men. The Convention completed its work and adjourned on the 23rd of March.⁴⁵ I returned home, sick at heart, but resolved to abide the fortunes of Georgia.

XI.

As a whole, I liked the Constitution adopted by the Congress at Montgomery for the Government of the Confederate States. In several respects, it was an improvement upon that of the United States. It put the subject of impost duties and internal improvements upon a basis so clearly defined as to avoid the abuses which have been so grievously practiced by the Federal Government, under a latitudinous construction of its Constitution. It extended the Presidential Term to six years and made him ineligible to re-election thus diminishing the frequency of those exciting contests for that office, so dangerous and demoralizing to the Country, and removing the temptation to shape his administration with the view of securing a second term. It gave the privilege to Cabinet ministers of a seat in the Senate, to the end that they might explain their recommendations and vindicate their official conduct. It placed the institution of slavery on a basis that would prevent future agitation. It prohibited the appropriation of money from the Treasury (except upon the recommendation of one of the heads of Departments) unless the same should pass by a majority of two thirds of both Houses of Congress. There were other improvements, which it is unnecessary to designate, since it does not necessarily appertain to a narrative like this.

I cordially approved the election of Jefferson Davis and Alexander H. Stephens to the first and second offices of the Confederacy. I thought Mr. Davis was unfortunate in the composition of his Cabinet and that he never made it any better by any of the changes from the beginning to the downfall of the Confederacy. Except Mr. Toombs and Mr. Hunter,⁴⁶ he never called into his political family a truly representative man—not one distinguished for talent or statesmanship—Mr. Toombs possessed great ability, but he was too rash and impetuous; Mr. Hunter was able and experienced—suited to times of peace, but too timid for revolution. The fire of the former, tempered by the coolness of the latter, combined with the ability of either, would have made a Statesman suited to the crisis,—such an one, in view of results, as should have been the Chief Magistrate.

I thought the Congress at Montgomery made two grand mistakes in view of the prospect of war. One was the failure to make free the Navi-

⁴⁵ The convention adjourned at Milledgeville Jan. 29, to meet at the call of its president, came together again at Savannah Mar. 7, and continued in session there till Mar. 23. *Journal*, pp. 125, 131, 224, 302; *Confed. Rec. Ga.*, I. 376, 381, 507, 615.

⁴⁶ Robert Toombs and Robert M. T. Hunter, successively secretaries of state in 1861.

gation of the Mississippi River; the other, to conciliate, by offers of the most liberal terms of trade and alliance, if necessary, to the great North Western States, through which it and its tributaries flow. That stream is the great highway to the Ocean, for much the larger portion of territory which lies between the Allegheny and Rocky Mountains. The control of its mouth constituted one of the principle inducements for the purchase of Louisiana. However pacific therefore, might have been the disposition of the people of those States, it was not to be expected that they would even stand neutral, much less aid us, when they saw that the success of the Confederacy, would be a perpetual tribute, levied upon all their transports upon that great "inland sea".

I thought the firing upon Fort Sumter was a fatal blunder, if peace was desired, and when peace was a necessity. It irritated the Northern people, united them in the defence of their flag; and when war was seen to be inevitable, I thought the financial and military policy of the Confederate authorities evinced an entire misconception of the magnitude and scope of the contest. That policy was meager and without system and inadequate to an efficient wielding of the resources of the Country.

I was at home in retirement without the expectation of any active participation in the struggle; but being an attentive spectator, these were a few of my criticisms upon passing events. They may have been foolish; but they did no harm, for the reason that I avoided the promulgation of my views, being determined that no word or deed of mine should ever be quoted or referred to as the means of embarrassment to our cause. Friends frequently wrote to me for my opinion. I replied frankly. Nearly all such letters were destroyed and therefore, it is not possible for me to produce them. I have a few—one to Judge A. E. Cochran, and some to Mr. Stephens, which he has kindly furnished to me calculated to illustrate my reflections upon the great struggle. They will be found in this collection. When Mr. Toombs retired from the Department of State, in Mr. Davis' Cabinet, he was elected to the Confederate Senate, together with Mr. B. H. Hill. My name was voted for at the same time, but without my approbation or consent. But Mr. Toombs declined, whereupon, Dr. John W. Lewis⁴⁷ was appointed by Governor Joseph E. Brown to fill his vacancy. Dr. Lewis resigned during the year, 1862, and I was elected by the Legislature in December of that year to fill out this unexpired term. I did not desire and consequently was not a candidate. My election was unexpected and by no means agreeable to me, except that I was personally gratified, with the confidence in my integrity and patriotism, which it evinced. I had immolated myself by my alliance with Douglas, in 1860; I became still more unpopular, if possible, by my opposition to the policy of secession. My election, under the circumstances, was a public acknowledgment that my antecedents justified, to some extent, the soundness of my judgment and vindicated the honesty of my motives, in the public estimation. After my election I was urged to go to Milledgeville and address the people, including the members of the General Assembly. This I did, on the 4th of December, 1862. (*Vid. Collection for the speech as reported.*) When I reached Richmond to enter upon the Senatorial office, I found myself already elected as one of the members of the Committee on Finance. My health was very feeble, the weather inclement, and consequently, I was not able, if disposed, to be prominent in the proceedings

⁴⁷ Previously superintendent of the state railroad, the Western and Atlantic.

of the Senate. All I can say is that I approved scarcely any of the financial measures, but voted against nearly all of them. The practice of "taking private property"—provisions, etc., to supply the army had already been commenced. Hence at an early day, I introduced a bill to regulate impressments and to determine compensation by arbitration.⁴⁸ Several other bills on the same subject were afterwards offered and all referred to the Judiciary Committee. My purpose was to prevent oppression and robbery and fix proper limits to the business of impressment. The result finally was that a board of three were appointed in each State to fix prices of supplies. To me this scheme was very objectionable, but I voted for it in the first instance as the best that could be done, and better than nothing. But the whole thing degenerated into monstrous abuse and led to widespread dissatisfaction. I believe it did much to crush out the war spirit of the people and diminish their attachment to the cause. Early in the same session, I introduced a bill proposing an amendment to the State [Confederate States] Constitution, by which, in my judgment, secession would never again be resorted to, or if it should, it would necessarily be peaceable.⁴⁹ At the time I introduced the bill, not having examined especially the point, that the Congress had the right, as that of the United States has, to propose amendments to the Confederate Constitution. But Mr. Yancy of Alabama called my attention to the change and hence, I withdrew my bill. But I was assailed for its introduction and particularly by the Savannah Republican. I replied to the strictures of the Editor, showing the necessity of a State veto upon the unconstitutional action of Congress, as the only means by which the minority could arrest the tendency to usurpation and oppression, by the majority; and that the perfection of government consisted, in having an efficient provision within the organization for the peaceable adjustment of controversy touching the relative powers of the States and those of the Confederate States. I felt a deep interest in the subject and regretted that I was precluded from having it fully discussed and acted upon. My letter to the Republican is included in the Collection. There was also another question before the Senate, in which I took a deep interest growing out of the Bill pending for the organization of the Supreme Court.⁵⁰ It was, whether the Congress had the power under the Constitution to confer upon that tribunal appellate jurisdiction over the State Courts. I took the negative side. The question was ably debated. (*Vid. Collection, etc., for my speech.*)

The term which I was elected to fill, being to expire on the 22nd of February, 1864, I was re-elected by the Legislature, at the session preceding—November or October, 1863. I was therefore a Confederate States Senator at the time of General Lee's surrender, and my period [of] service extended from January, 1862,⁵¹ to the adjournment of Congress in the spring of 1865.

⁴⁸ Introduced Feb. 5, 1863. *Journal of the Congress of the Confederate States of America*, III. 50. The bill finally passed was a House bill, approved Mar. 26. *Ibid.*, III. 216.

⁴⁹ Introduced Feb. 5, withdrawn Feb. 7. *Ibid.*, III. 50, 55.

⁵⁰ Senate Bill 3, introduced Jan. 19, 1863 (*ibid.*, III. 20), and much debated, but apparently never passed. The journal gives no evidence as to action respecting it by Senator Johnson.

⁵¹ Jan. 19, 1863, rather.

A few reflections upon my career in that body will close this Section of my narrative.

About the time I was first elected to [the] Senate I was writhing under the depression of spirit produced by what I thought the entire absence of any definite financial system or well considered military policy. It seemed that all our energies and resources were to be concentrated on the Potomac and the enemy permitted to take possession of the coast from Hatteras to the Rio Grande. I was particularly nervous in consequences of the exposed condition of the coast of Georgia; for it seemed to be the policy of the government to make no effort for its protection. Our ports were blockaded; and [I] thought there should be exerted every energy to prevent our coast border from being seized by the Federal forces. It was an alarming fact that the Secretary of the Treasury seemed to have no scheme of finance that would supply credit for the Government or a supply of the material for the war. He had just published a letter to the produce loan commission, the sum and substance of which was, that the Government did not have the Constitutional power to purchase the cotton on hand and as a means of raising money (for there was no market for cotton) the planters should grow winter crops, spin, weave, knit and supplicate the Banks; and it wound up by telling them that they were such a sagacious class that they would thus obtain all the relief they needed. I was not surprised that Congress did not make advances for cotton *eo nomine*, but the right of seizure upon just compensation, of all the cotton, rice and tobacco, was ample under the Constitution. Hence, I was in favor of such a measure as a basis on which the Confederate Government could have negotiated loans, without difficulty to almost an indefinite sum. The planters would have gladly accepted in payment, one third cash, with the balance secured by 6 pct. Bonds payable in specie at the end of the war. It was under the influence of convictions like these that I went into the Senate. I went there hoping that something energetic and efficient might be done, when all the indications showed that it was so necessary. But I was greatly disappointed in my anticipations. Conscription, which had already been resorted to, so far from being abandoned, was adhered to and rendered still more objectionable, by increasing the age of men subject to military duties, thus crippling agriculture, injuring the police over the slave population and leaving women and children at home unprotected. To me conscription was very odious, because it *compelled* men to fight for liberty—enslaved them under the pretext of making them free. But there were great principles violated by it. It ignored the rights of the States under the Constitution. It was despotic. It crushed out the Volunteer Spirit, on which it was proposed at first to wage the war. I never questioned the power of the Govt. to require the service of every arms bearing citizen; and if in the beginning it had made a call on the States for their entire Militia force, converted the Confederacy into a grand military camp and commissariat and marched into the enemies' country, lived upon them, desolated them, without the offer of any other reward to the soldier than that of liberty and good government, I should have been more hopeful of success. I objected to conscription further, because it clothed the Executive with more power than was safe to popular liberty; it put the entire country with all its interests and rights personal and civil at the mercy of a huge military organization amenable to no earthly power; it would lead to a system of tyranny and cruelty on

the part of military officers towards the soldiery, degrading to the spirit of freemen; it would rob independence, if we succeeded, of half the glory of its achievement, so that it would be for the historian to record, that the sons of liberty, while professing to fight for it, had to be dragged to the battle field in chains; it was a confession of weakness and destroyed all hope of our recognition by the United States. I found it hopeless to attempt to put the Impressment policy on any basis acceptable to the people, for the reason of its inevitable liability to abuse. I disapproved of nearly every measure of finance introduced into Congress. They were all calculated to inflate the currency, enhance prices, drive out the precious metals and thus encourage the spirit of speculation and speculation. I deplored the suspension of the Writ of Habeas Corpus. First, because I did not think it was necessary; Secondly, because it was so liable to be used—and it was used though not so intended, for purposes of oppression upon mere civilians, and thirdly, because it fostered the tendency to despotism which is always engendered by war, under the most favorable circumstances. The effort should be, during a war for liberty, to *restrain* this tendency—not encourage it, by putting it in the power of officers to oppress, under the forms and apparent sanction of Laws. It is the essence of liberty, especially under our political system, that the *military* shall be subordinate to the civil power. The suspension of the Writ, to a great extent, reverses the order.

I did not pretend to make myself prominent in the Senate, because I found that my views were so averse to the policy of the administration, and the effort to enforce them so hopeless, that I contented myself with giving my views mildly and in few words and in voting according to the convictions of my judgment. Mr. Davis Cabinet being weak, they were not capable of wielding in a manner equal to emergency their several departments and Mr. Davis being a man of most decided and affirmative temper, perfectly self reliant, and withal susceptible of flattery, that they did not differ from him. My relations with Mr. Davis were pleasant. He is an orator, but not a Statesman suited to the time in which he was called to act. But a truer, braver man never lived. He had the cause deeply at heart and would at any hour have surrendered it⁵² for success. His errors were those of the head; and it is not strange that he erred. For his responsibility was too great for human strength and the storm too furious to be guided by the wisdom of any one man. He erred in not using the talent and Statesmanship of the Country to assist him. Such should have been his counsellors, but he selected weak men.

Whilst this was my attitude to the measures of the Government during the war, I took no part with those who felt it to be their duty to oppose and openly denounce them. I had no sympathy with the Wigfalls, and Toombs and Browns. I thought their course did great injury to our cause, was calculated to destroy the confidence of the people in the government, and lead to counter revolution. Hence, I acquiesced in what I could not approve and sought to eliminate the best results from it. I do [did] so, because I knew that whatever of hope there may have been for ultimate triumph must rest upon the zeal of the people and their reliance upon their chosen leaders. I cannot do better than give a short extract from a letter I wrote to Mr. Stephens, March 9th, 1864.

“I will not participate in denouncing Congress and the President, because my views do not prevail. I have my opinions of men and meas-

⁵² Meaning, probably, the presidency.

ures. I shall enjoy them and act according to my convictions of duty. If the war cannot be conducted on my plan—if the policies of the administration do not meet my sanction (as it does not, in many respects) I will fight the war according to the President's plan and policy and try to cause, so far as I can, the best results to flow from what I may not approve. This may be an error, be it so, it is an honest error and accords best with my views of patriotic duty and sound Statesmanship." In accordance with this feeling, despondent, as I was, from the beginning, I was cautious in giving public expression to it. When we won victories, I frequently had a flash of hope and so expressed it in letters and speeches. For I knew that nothing but harm to result from public croaking.

In September, 1864, appearances were gloomy; the hearts of many failed; they look[ed] to the election of Genl. McClellan Pres. of the United States with much anxiety; they desired and thought that something might be done, in that direction, by inaugurating a peace movement in the South. To ascertain my views on this subject, I was addressed by several gentlemen in Macon. My reply is in this Collection. (*Vid. letter to several gentlemen, etc., dated Sep. 25, 1864.*)

I was not disappointed at the result of the war—I feared defeat and disaster from the beginning—I believed slavery would fall with the Confederacy and that an almost irreparable shock to Constitutional Government would characterise the final triumph of the Federal army.

XII.

Ruined by the war, I returned to the bar in order to make a living. I formed a partnership with the Hon. Ebenezer Starnes of Augusta,⁵³ Georgia. Our association continued for about two years. But it is now (December, 1867) terminated. It was my purpose to abstain from all participation in politics, but I have [not] been quite able to execute it. I was, without solicitation or desire on my part, elected to the State Convention, which was called in pursuance of Andrew Johnson's Proclamation to reorganize our Government. The Convention met on the ——— day of ———, 1865.⁵⁴ I was chosen its President. Its proceedings are before the world. Its concessions to the victorious power show how earnestly the vanquished in a gallant and patriotic struggle, sought harmony and peace. The failure to secure it coupled with our continued exclusion from representation in Congress, will stand a monument as lasting as time and eloquent as history, of the treachery, hypocrisy and meanness of the God-forsaken and hell deserving fanatics and tyrants that rule the country and desecrate the Constitution which they *swore* to support. I took no part in the deliberations and debates upon the floor of the Convention. My position as presiding officer was onerous and required all my power; for it was the first experience I had ever had. All said I acquitted myself well. My speech, just prior to pronouncing final adjournment is in this Collection. It produced deep sensation. More than half the Convention were in tears and we all parted with feelings softened by the sad associations and memories of the war.

⁵³ Judge of the supreme court of Georgia 1853–1856.

⁵⁴ Oct. 25. For an account of the convention, see C. Mildred Thompson, *Reconstruction in Georgia*, pp. 147–153, and its *Journal*.

The State being organized, I was elected by the Legislature next following, to wit, on ——— day of ———, ⁵⁵ 1866 to the Senate of the United States for two years to expire on the 4th of March, 1867. And at the session of 1866-7, I was again elected for six years from the 4th of March, 1867. Of course, I have not been permitted to take my seat in that body. Why? first, because I cannot take the iron clad oath; and secondly because Georgia is declared by the ruling party to be out of the Union, notwithstanding a victorious war by the United States to keep her in!

During the year, 1866, a movement was set on foot, for a conservative Convention to meet in Philadelphia on the 14th of August.⁵⁶ It was expected by its advocates North and South, to result in much good, in the direction of a harmonious restoration of the Union. I think a majority of the white people of the State of Georgia were in favor of sending delegates; whilst a large number doubted the policy. I was among the latter, but being anxious to do everything in our power to forward the professed aims of the Convention, I yielded my misgivings and acquiesced in the movement. I was appointed a delegate for the State at Large, by all the Congressional Districts, who held Conventions for the purpose of sending delegates. I received from Dr. R. A. T. Ridley of Troup County, the President of the Convention for the Third Congressional District, informing me of my appointment by the same and requesting my acceptance. I declined. My reasons will be found in my reply of August 10th to be found in this collection.

On Saturday, the 13th of April, 1867, a meeting purporting, by its call, to be a gathering without distinction of color, was held at the parade ground, in the City of Augusta, ostensibly for the purpose of considering calmly the interest and duty of the white and black people, in view of their new and altered relation. Judge Gould, Judge Starnes, Mr. Hilliard and myself were invited to attend and address the meeting. But when we arrived at the place we found that the radical leader had packed the meeting and prepared a set of resolutions to form a radical party. There were but few whites in attendance. Under these circumstances, it was questionable whether those of us who had been invited to address the meeting should do so. Judge Gould did decline; on reflection, Judge Starnes and myself thought it best to speak and did so. Mr. Hilliard also spoke. He seemed to sympathise with the real (secret) object of the meeting. Judge Starnes and I acted under the hope that we might say something to promote good feeling and friendship between the races and avert the calamity of their being arrayed in hostile political organizations. But we wasted breath and words. The following slip from the Augusta Constitutionalist contains the substance of my remarks on that occasion. On the 11th of August, 1867, as a general reply to sundry calls for the expression of my views, concerning the proceedings of the Philadelphia Convention of the 14th of August, 1866, I published an elaborate letter which is in this collection. It speaks for itself. In response to a call from a conservative committee of Fulton County for my opinions of the duty of the people of Georgia, touching the military

⁵⁵ Sept. 11. *Journal of the Senate of Georgia*, p. 359.

⁵⁶ The National Union Convention, called by the National Union Club of Washington, and embracing various conservative elements. See "Three Days in Philadelphia", in the *Nation* of Aug. 23, and J. L. Vollandigham, *Life of Clement L. Vollandigham*, pp. 408-412.

acts of reconstruction, I wrote a letter dated the —— day of ——, 1867. It will be found in this collection.

Comments upon that letter by the Editor drew from me the two letters to the New York Tribune,—the one dated August 6th, the other September the 6th, 1867.

This brings my political career down to the present time (December 27th, 1867). I have been an active participant in public affairs from 1840 down to this day. I have been laborious, faithful and honest. I have been honored by my fellow-citizens sufficient to gratify a reasonable ambition. I trust I now enjoy the confidence of my countrymen. I have been a staunch, though feeble advocate of the rights of the States, a strict construction of the Constitution of the United States and the integrity of the Union upon the basis of the Constitution according to my honest convictions of its letter and spirit. At the end of such a career I find myself disfranchised and assigned by the dominant Despots in Congress a position, politically subordinate to my former slaves; and a Convention is now in Session at Atlanta, whose object is to put my native State and all others of the South under negro Dominion!!!

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

The Roman Occupation of Britain, being six Ford Lectures delivered by F. HAVERFIELD, now revised by GEORGE MACDONALD. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. 304. Map. 18 s.)

THE dedication of the volume by the Public Orator of Oxford in beautiful Latin shows that the work was intended as a tribute from Oxford University to the memory of the first scientific investigator of Roman Britain, William Camden, and to a man to whom England is much indebted for the first modern attempt at a systematic, up-to-date study of Roman Britain—the late Francis Haverfield, Camden Professor of Roman History in the University of Oxford from 1905 to 1919. The importance of Haverfield's work for Roman Britain is well known. A pupil and a friend both of Pelham and of Mommsen, he combined in his person the best features of both the German and the English scholarship. Thoroughness of information, strong critical attitude toward the sources, painstaking accuracy in the preliminary work of copying and commenting upon the inscriptions and in classifying the archaeological material were the features Haverfield took from the Germans. Lucidity in presentation, clean-cut ideas, a fine sense of humor, and an unusual talent for grasping the essential showed him to be a true son of his country, a successor of the great English historians of the past. Out of a chaos of half-scientific endeavors of local antiquarians Haverfield succeeded in creating a well-organized picture of Roman Britain and in starting in England the first attempt at systematic scientific excavations and investigations of the Roman remains in Britain. He began with studying and publishing the Latin inscriptions of Britain, and his last thought was to republish the antiquated seventh volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* in a more adequate and more modern form, a task in which the author of this review was invited to help him. Let us hope that in the competent hands of R. G. Collingwood and J. G. C. Anderson the new English *Corpus* will soon render the services which the late Haverfield expected it to render. In his endeavors as an epigraphist Haverfield earned the great honor of being entrusted by Mommsen with the task of publishing the supplements to the *C. I. L.*, VII. In fulfilling this task he showed himself not inferior to his German colleagues. Not satisfied with studying the inscriptions, Haverfield soon began to study the history of Roman Britain in all its aspects, visiting all the important sites, taking part in the works of almost all the local archaeological societies of England, collecting all the available material both in the libraries and the museums, organizing,

supervising, and guiding the most important archaeological excavations (one of the best was his personal excavation of Corbridge on the Tyne). Scores of papers published in various English and German periodicals testify to the enormous progress which the history of Roman Britain made under his care and guidance. Splendid monographs, especially those on the various regions of Britain in the *Victoria County History*, on the cities of Roman Britain, on the military "camps" of the frontiers, on the various local museums, prepared a work of generalization which Haverfield always had in mind. As a matter of fact he never succeeded in achieving his great final book. Even if he had lived longer, he probably would not have produced it. He saw clearly how little we know and how much work ought to be done before such a final work could be produced. Fortunately, however, on two occasions he was forced to gather together the main results of his work and to summarize his most important views, the first time in 1905 in a paper read before the British Academy, the second in 1907 in six Ford Lectures delivered at Oxford. The first attempt was published under the title *The Romanization of Roman Britain* originally in the *Proceedings* of the Academy and later (in four editions, the last posthumous, revised by George Macdonald in 1923) as a separate book. He also intended to publish his Ford Lectures and in 1913 and 1914 began a thorough revision of his manuscript. Death prevented him from seeing this book printed. It was reserved for his friends, first of all Mr. Macdonald, a recognized authority on Roman Britain, to do it for him and to publish his lectures in a revised, up-to-date form. We must be grateful to Mr. Macdonald for his unselfish work, for his masterly sketch of Haverfield's life, for an almost full bibliography of Haverfield's books and articles, and for his excellent additional notes. Thanks to his efforts we have now in the Ford Lectures a valuable and important addition to the well-known book on the *Romanization of Roman Britain*. As a matter of fact the two books do not duplicate each other. It is natural that some of the chapters are almost identical in the two books, e.g., the chapters on Romano-British civilization. However, even in these chapters, the later book brings some new presentations of many sides of Romano-British life and some new ideas on questions of detail. Almost entirely new are, however, the three first chapters. The first gives a sketch of the history of Romano-British investigations, full of new facts and of brilliant judgments. The second, which was bitterly missed in the book on Romanization, contains a careful and up-to-date account of the conquest of Britain, and the third a general survey of the military occupation of the land. New to a large extent is also chapter VI., Roman Britain and Saxon England. It is useless to praise the book as a whole. It must be carefully read by everybody who is interested in the history of England. Brilliant style and a wonderful lucidity of exposition make reading a real pleasure even from a purely literary and aesthetic point of view. Oxford knows how to honor her great sons. No wonder that the Oxfordians are so fond of their alma mater and that

in his last will and testament Haverfield connected Oxford forever with his own personal scientific endeavors and achievements.

M. ROSTOVITZEFF.

A History of the British People. By EDWARD MASLIN HULME, Associate Professor of History in Stanford University. (New York and London: Century Company. 1924. Pp. xiii, 717. \$3.75.)

PROFESSOR HULME has written a history of the British people from a particular point of view. He is, so the preface says, a social idealist. This term, it would seem, describes one who is half poet and literary critic, a bit of a philosopher, a sympathetic spectator of the industrial poor—and on all three counts is fervidly and abstractly preoccupied with the idea of the state. In this triple capacity a writer might contrive an entertaining history; and those who care to follow Professor Hulme upon the exalted note and through the transcendental mood of his narrative will find that he soars above the sober plane of matter-of-fact politics. With the usual history of the British Isles his work combines a manual of authors, and an occasional excursion among speculative thinkers, enough to make up an outline of philosophy. At first glance the unity of a history might appear to be lost by this method; but Professor Hulme is able to treat both literature and philosophy as a criticism of politics and to draw from each its political implications. The trend of politics and the changing idea of the state he thus shows through the minds of authors and speculative thinkers as well as of statesmen. The effect is, or should be, to broaden the political horizon of the student—for the book is written down to the comprehension of a junior college class.

The apparent gain is reached, it is to be feared, at the expense of confusion and blurring of perspectives. Taking the narrative consecutively, an indiscriminating student might readily entertain a doubt as to whether or not the metaphysics of Locke or of Berkeley were of greater national importance than the successful legislative union between England and Scotland; whether, again, the Romantic poets should be more considered than the ill-conceived legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland; or whether the musical verse of Swinburne—described in the index as the poet of rationalism and democracy—ought to take precedence of old-age pensions. In other words congruity is here not natural, but forced. Three shorter treatises, used separately, would yield clearer knowledge.

In regard to historical scholarship the verdict can be more decisive. Professor Hulme mentions one or two historical scholars who, as he expresses it, saved him from many mistakes. This friendly criticism might have been carried further. It might have revised many a verbal ambiguity that destroys precision where precision is most needed. The

term "British People", for example, Professor Hulme employs as though a people of that name existed: we search in vain for a hint of the constructive meaning of the term, or for a hint of the stress and strain incidental to four neighboring peoples long experimenting indecisively with political separation and political union. The statement that Lord Rosebery, "being a lord", could not take a seat in the House of Commons, needs no comment. To describe the Anglican Church as a State Church is misleading, if not offensive; more misleading is it to refer to the stipends of the clergy as government taxation. A sentence asserting that "the great Scottish writers such as Smollett, Hume, Adam Smith, and Robertson, all wrote excellent English", no context could justify; its amazing obviousness verges upon a challenge to reason. Careful revision would make the book more suitable as a students' history.

C. E. FRYER.

Essays in Early Christian History. By ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL, Professor of Latin in the University of Chicago. (London: Macmillan and Company. 1924. Pp. viii, 344. 15 s.)

PROFESSOR MERRILL'S book seems to discuss two separate subjects—the earliest persecutions of Christians in the Roman Empire, and the growth of the Petrine tradition in Rome. I imagine that the former may have grown out of the attempt to disprove the Petrine tradition, but to most historians it will seem the more important.

It has been widely held that the persecution of Christians was based on an *Institutum Neronianum*, or on an edict of one of the Flavian emperors; but Professor Merrill argues that this is unsupported by the evidence. The first Christians who were put to death by Nero were convicted of arson, and the others were condemned because the crime was supposed to have been undertaken by them all. In other words Christians were attacked because of their supposed misdeeds, not for their religion. There is no sufficient evidence that there was really a persecution under Domitian, and the persecution in Bithynia under Trajan was because Christians formed a *hetaeria* and Trajan had forbidden all *hetaeriae* in the province.

The argument on this point is very clear, and I think that Professor Merrill is probably right. I have never been able to see that the case of the opposite opinion is as strong as Neumann and Ramsay have maintained. There is only one point on which I should have welcomed somewhat more discussion. Pliny's letter certainly seems to imply that Christians had been tried before the time at which he wrote, though he was ignorant of the exact procedure. It is quite possible that the prejudice started in the time of Nero continued, that treason, cannibalism, and incest (*teste* Athenagoras) were added to arson, and that there was held to be a presumption against any member of the Christian church that he was guilty of these offenses. This, if I understand him rightly, is Professor

Merrill's position. I believe that he is right; but my belief would be more sturdy if Pliny and Trajan had expressed themselves a little more clearly.

In the course of this argument mention is naturally made of I Clement. I am delighted to find that Professor Merrill has elaborated a position indicated in outline in my *Landmarks* (which he has probably never seen), to the effect that the reference to Clement in Hermas is a much more important fact than has often been admitted, and should be the starting-point of all discussion. To students of early Christian literature this discussion of the date of I Clement and its assignment to ± 140 will probably be the most novel point in the book, and ought to evoke serious discussion. What, it may be asked in passing, is the importance of the fact that the evidence for I Clement's continued authority is Alexandrian, not Roman or Corinthian? It is preserved as scripture in the Codex Alexandrinus, in quotations by Clement of Alexandria and in some copies of the Harclean Syriac, which in some obscure way is connected with the monastery of the Enaton, nine miles from Alexandria.

The last two chapters of the book deal with the Church in the fourth century and with the question of Peter's position in Rome. They are less interesting and are a not very convincing attempt to discredit the Roman tradition of Peter.

The book as a whole is stimulating, learned, and valuable. It is a great boon to "Biblical" and ecclesiastical scholars to have the help of classicists such as Professor Merrill, though his allusions to them suggest that he has not always been fortunate in those whom he has met. This probably accounts for some minor defects in his treatment of the Apocalypse and of I Peter. Neither of these books is adequately discussed, and the authenticity of I Peter cannot be assumed so lightly. These are, however, small points, and Biblical scholars will forgive Professor Merrill if he will continue his contributions. After all, it is only that he is so permeated by the spirit of the period which he discusses that, like Nero, he condemns a class for the offenses of some of its members and unconsciously thinks of them all as guilty of *flagitia cohaerentia nomini*.

K. LAKE.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Benedictine Monachism: Studies in Benedictine Life and Rule. By Dom CUTHBERT BUTLER, Monk of Downside Abbey. Second edition, with Supplementary Notes. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1924. Pp. x, 424. 10 s. 6 d.)

THIS is a reprint of the first edition,¹ without changes of text, but with thirty-four pages of supplementary notes, some of them additions or corrections, the most important of them discussions of questions that have been raised by Benedictine critics. The replies to these questionings

¹ See *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVI. 754.

and criticisms are so impersonal that in the majority of cases Dom Butler does not name the reviewer whom he is answering nor tell where the criticism may be found, a course that obviously increases the difficulty of determining whether in any given instance the author or his critic has the better case.

The book is an exposition of the philosophy, the theory, of the Benedictine life and rule, written with the main purpose of defending the view that the changes found in Benedictine monachism are a natural unfolding or development and the monastic life to-day is a fair presentment to the twentieth century of the original. That St. Benedict did not intend his monks to practise great bodily austerity, and that the centre of monasterial life is the Benedictine family, the autonomous, autocephalous monastery, are, in Dom Butler's judgment, cardinal truths. Failure to recognize them leads to a misunderstanding of the mind of St. Benedict, while, once they are grasped, we can apply Newman's doctrine of development to the institution and come to the conclusion that the changes in Black Benedictinism are the result of growth and are not out of harmony with the ideas of the founder. That is the conclusion reached by Dom Butler, though he states it with some hesitation in what he calls his "crucial chapter" on the Benedictine Ideal in the Centuries.

The appeal from the Rule to the Cave, which the author says has been made by some of his critics, involves the abandonment of the cenobitical life—the monastic family life—as the Benedictine ideal, in favor of the eremitical; and also, at least by implication, it requires, in addition to spiritual ascesis, bodily austerity of marked rigor. The thesis that the eremitical life is the consummation to which the cenobitical might be hoped to lead Dom Butler answers by an appeal to history: the eremitical life has no place in the great currents of Benedictine tradition. That the Rule, rather than the Cave or the experiment at Subiaco, represents the full mind of St. Benedict has an immediate bearing on the question of asceticism: if he intended his monks to be cenobites and not solitaries, so likewise the great reduction that he made in the element of bodily austerity must be taken as reflecting his final judgment on ascesis.

The argument advanced to support the main thesis of the book—that the monastic life of to-day is a fair presentment of the original—is questioned by Benedictine critics; and the author in reply does little save to quote from the review of the first edition in the *English Historical Review*. That present-day Benedictinism differs greatly from that of the sixth century is unquestioned, nor are the changes in minor matters only. Dom Butler postulates five fundamental principles of the Rule as the norm of Benedictine theory: cenobitic life in the monastery; the monastic family, with its corollaries; the *Opus Dei*; spiritual ascesis; and work; and of these only the first and possibly the fourth survive unimpaired. The accepted juridic interpretation of stability, and the short-term election of abbots, cut at the roots of the monastic family; nowhere is the entire

canonical office chanted daily; the matter of work is the chief difficulty and failure of Black Monk life.

The supplementary notes increase our obligation to the author, yet it is a matter of regret that he gives us a reprint rather than a revised edition.

ALFRED H. SWEET.

Allgemeine Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Mittelalters. Von Dr. RUDOLF KÖTZSCHKE, Professor an der Universität Leipzig. [Handbuch der Wirtschaftsgeschichte, herausgegeben von Dr. Georg Brodnitz, Professor der Staatswissenschaften in Halle a. S.] (Jena: Verlag von Gustav Fischer. 1924. Pp. xiv, 626. 15 M., gold.)

THIS *General Economic History of the Middle Ages* covers the period roughly from 400 to 1500, with most attention devoted to the period 800 to 1100. The emphasis is upon German lands, but other peoples are not forgotten. The author looks at economic history in a broad way. He reminds us that his treatment is like that of Lamprecht, Inama-Sternegg, Levasseur, and Cunningham. Like them he weaves together many factors: he never forgets the ecclesiastical and political aspects of his period. And like them, too, he is historical rather than genetic: he prefers to describe situations and narrate events rather than state theories of economic progress. This is, at any rate, what he claims; but in places he weaves together both historical and genetic, after the manner of Sir William Ashley.

As is to be expected from the period emphasized, relatively little attention is paid to trade and manufacture but a good deal to agriculture. The technique of medieval cultivation is explained, adequately as far as field cultivation is concerned but scantily in respect to animal husbandry. Agrarian differences and developments are set forth at some length. The *Grundherrschaft* and the *Gutsherrschaft* are briefly explained. The controversial "Mark" is dealt with in the light of recent investigations. The mark was a free village with a duality of land rights. The yard, garden, arable fields, and meadows were privately owned, while the pasture, forest, and ponds and streams were more communal. The author assures us that there was no strong corporation ownership vested in the village group in the sense of a juristic person as distinct from the individuals that made up the group. Special attention, it should be noted, is devoted to the Crusades, money economy, and economic ideas.

Europe is dealt with generally, first the west then the east, from England to Byzantium, and from Prussia to the Islamic peoples. But Germany looms large, as we might expect from the author's earlier writings. German sources constitute the main reliance. For Germany they are frequently primary; and, when secondary, they are quite up-to-date.

Generally speaking, we are introduced (by foot-notes) to the literature of the various topics, the newer articles and books being emphasized, often to the exclusion of the older pioneering works.

This book is but one in a series being published under the editorship of Professor Georg Brodnitz of Halle. Those writers who have to record the economic history of specific peoples get off rather lightly. One of the most difficult tasks is the writing of the volume now being reviewed. To be sure, the Church and the Empire bestowed upon the Middle Ages some pretense of unity; and first the village, then the town, gave to medieval economic history a degree of uniformity of development. Nevertheless the differences were great as between one century and another, one nation and another. The present volume has emphasized conditions or types in Germany, without showing very clearly wherein the other peoples differed economically. There is probably no other single book, however, which gives so much compact information about medieval economic history.

N. S. B. GRAS.

Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science. By CHARLES HOMER HASKINS, Gurney Professor of History and Political Science in Harvard University. [Harvard Historical Studies, vol. XXVII.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1924. Pp. xiv, 411. \$6.00.)

In this volume Professor Haskins gathers together his various papers concerning the intellectual life of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries in western Europe which have been appearing for the past fifteen years in different learned periodicals, such as this journal, the *English Historical Review*, the *Romanic Review*, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, and *Isis*. As the titles of these periodicals suggest, the work is one that should make a wide appeal to scholars, whether historians, scientists, or students of philology and classical or medieval literature. These papers maintained and added to the high reputation for historical scholarship which their author had already achieved in other fields of research, and in almost every case were in the nature of new discoveries or further contributions to knowledge, making more precise than it had been our information concerning various personalities, writings, and intellectual movements of the period in question. These previously printed articles now appear in a revised form, correcting or supplementing the few points that required this, and bringing the bibliographical matter up to date with the recent literature. Scholars who have already used and valued them will be delighted to have them now in a convenient form within one cover, and it is to be hoped that their appearance in book form may recommend them to a wide circle of new readers.

New material in addition to these former studies appears for the first time in print in the present volume in the case of four chapters, one

introductory, the others dealing with Hermann of Carinthia, Some Twelfth-Century Writers on Astronomy, and Translators in Syria during the Crusades. The tenth chapter, on North-Italian Translators of the Twelfth Century, also combines some new material with the contents of three previously published articles. There are eighteen chapters or studies in all.

These studies are largely concerned with chronological and bibliographical problems rather than with the scientific content of medieval literature, and rather more attention is given to translators than to authors. The identity of such writers is distinguished, dates in their careers are determined, the number of their known works is added to, the manuscripts are listed (would that some indication as to their date was more often given!), and the Latin of the preface or opening pages is printed. But these passages inform us rather concerning the identity of the author or translator and the date of the work than as to the nature of medieval science. Indeed, Professor Haskins's great contribution in this field has been to investigate the twelfth-century Latin translations from Greek and Arabic. In this and in his method he rather follows in the footsteps of Boncompagni and Steinschneider. The book is exceedingly valuable in its bibliographical suggestions. But such bits of medieval science as the rather naïve experiment recorded at pages 31-32 or the commonplace set of questions by Frederick II., given both in English translation at pages 266-267 and Latin text at pages 292-294, do not strike the present reviewer as representing medieval science at its best. It might have been well at page 250 to add some reference respecting the law *De Medicis* of 1241 by Frederick II. at Naples to the mention there made of the statutes of 1224, 1231, 1234, and 1239; see M. del Gaizo, "Alcune Linee del Movimento della Chirurgica Italiana nel Secolo Decimoterzo", in *Annales Internationales d'Histoire, Congrès de Paris, 1900, V^e section, Histoire des Sciences* (Paris, 1901), pp. 236-237.

Except for the revision above mentioned, which manifests itself in the foot-notes rather than in the text, those portions of the book which had previously been printed as articles now for the most part appear as independent chapters in the same form, arrangement, and wording as before. It may be questioned if the author would not have made a more effective and unified book by somewhat recasting this material, avoiding such repetitions as that of the questions of Frederick II. already mentioned or the allusion to the barnacle geese at both page 263 and page 321, and perhaps putting the Latin prefaces into appendixes. The introductory passage concerning Frederick II. at page 299 would better be combined with the earlier one at page 242, and so on. Indeed, the chapters on Science at the Court of the Emperor Frederick II. and on Michael Scot might well be fused into one; and likewise those on Some Early Treatises on Falconry and the *De Arte Venandi cum Avibus* of Frederick II.

The additional evidence adduced by Professor Haskins at pages 138-139 makes me more ready to accept the canon of Byblos as the Philip of Tripoli who translated *The Secret of Secrets* than I was when Mr. Robert Steele first made the suggestion in 1920. I also favor his suggestion at page 369 that *ars medicinae* designated a group of treatises rather than a particular work, since the treatises which he mentions often, if not regularly, occur together in the manuscripts. At page 52 it might be well to cite Clerval's *Hermann le Dalmate* (1891), as well as his *Les Écoles de Chartres*, and the discussion of both Hermanns in my *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, I. 701-702. At pages 55-56 Professor Haskins seems to take a little too literally the rhetoric of the preface given at pages 48-49. This general assertion at page 356 seems too strong, "It was almost wholly as formulated in a few standard texts that the learning of the ancient world was transmitted to medieval times". In the first note at the bottom of the same page the word "results" is mystifying. Disputed points are not always sufficiently discussed to put the reader in a proper position to judge, and the arguments of others are sometimes too curtly and imperfectly represented. But on the whole there is very little to take exception to in this thoroughly scholarly piece of work.

The general appearance of the volume is much to the credit of the Harvard University Press, and slips in proof-reading seem very few (at p. 30, note 56, "Adalard" should be Adélard; at p. 44 in the fourth line from the bottom of the text "habet" should be followed by a dotted line, as it does not end the sentence which, indeed, it would perhaps be better to quote in full for the sake of the argument). It would have been a greater convenience for readers if, in those cases where a series of manuscripts are listed, a line had been allowed to each item. There are good indexes of manuscripts, of subjects, and of proper names.

LYNN THORNDIKE.

The Christian Renaissance: a History of the "Devotio Moderna".

By ALBERT HYMA. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Reformed Press. 1924. Pp. xviii, 501. \$4.00.)

PROFESSOR HARNACK was accustomed to say to his classes that there were two clues to the maze of history: creative personalities, and the principle of development. Both of these clues are carefully followed by Dr. Hyma in his effort to trace and evaluate the influence of that revival of religion and scholarship which, beginning in the fourteenth century in the little cities in the valley of the Yssel, gradually spread over western Europe and contributed much to the preparation for both the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. Among the creative personalities noticed are Gerard Groote and those immediately associated with him in the founding of the Brotherhood of the Common Life and such eminent products of the schools of the Brethren as Thomas a Kempis, Wessel

Gansfort, Alexander Hegius, and Erasmus. The Brethren of the Common Life are characterized as "practical mystics", laymen mainly, who in their free associations lived as brothers, cultivated a simple Biblical type of piety, and occupied themselves chiefly with the transcription of the Bible and other approved works of devotion and in the conduct of boarding-schools for boys.

The development of this movement, which took the name "*Devotio Moderna*", our author traces along three main lines: first, in the multiplication and wide extension of schools modelled after the original school of John Cele at Zwolle; second, in the wide circulation of certain devotional books such as the *Imitation of Christ*, which present the religious ideals of the order; and third, in a large number of influential men, who, having been under the instruction of the Brethren during the plastic period of early youth, carried with them into the priesthood or into monastic or secular life the ideas of religion and education so deeply impressed upon them by their skillful teachers and by the example of simple, cheerful, industrious piety set before them by those living the Common Life.

To the difficult task of tracing these three lines of development in the records of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Dr. Hyma has brought great industry in research and unusual critical acumen. He presents the reader with an interesting and instructive study in the conservation of moral energy by showing how the influence of a relatively obscure man, such as Gerard Groote, started a movement which more than a century later could powerfully affect the careers of men as widely diverse as Luther and Calvin and Ignatius Loyola.

It has been the custom to speak of the Renaissance as if it were merely a humanistic movement, beginning in Italy, and due to the recovery of a knowledge of the life and literature of the classic age. As so conceived, the Renaissance was usually regarded as tinged somewhat with paganism and inimical to the Church. But the intellectual awakening traced in this volume is accompanied by a revival in vital religion and proceeds in closest relation to the Church. Hence the justification in calling it the "Christian Renaissance".

The purpose of the book, as briefly stated by the author, is "to show how the New Devotion or Christian Renaissance, between 1380 and 1520, absorbed the wisdom of the ancients, the essence of Christ's teachings, the mystic religion of the Fathers and the saints of medieval Europe, as well as the learning of the Italian humanists; how it assimilated all these ingredients and presented them in a new dress to the old world and the new". The author's point of view may be inferred from the following statement: "It would be a mistake to say that the Reformation was the outgrowth of the Italian Renaissance, or that it began with the work of Martin Luther. The term itself was wrongly chosen. It misrepresents the true state of affairs, as does also the word, Counter-

Reformation. There was but one Reformation, and it included the Counter-Reformation."

The Christian Renaissance is the result of extended research carried on mainly in European libraries. It is carefully documented and indexed, and contains an extensive bibliography of sources, published and unpublished, and valuable appendixes, among them a copy of the original draft of the Constitution of the Brethren of the Common Life at Deventer.

Relatively few books of this sort are published in America, since their preparation requires extended residence abroad and a working acquaintance with a large number of languages and the study of sources often difficult of access. As might be expected, Dr. Hyma is a native of the Netherlands. He was educated partly there and partly at Calvin College, Grand Rapids, and at the University of Michigan, which recognized him with a fellowship and later with a doctorate, and has recently called him to an instructorship in the department of history. This book is his first extended publication. He is now at work upon another volume on the Brethren of the Common Life.

EDWARD WAITE MILLER.

Erasmus: a Study of his Life, Ideals, and Place in History. By PRESERVED SMITH, Ph.D., Litt.D., Professor of History in Cornell University. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1923. Pp. xiv, 479. \$4.00.)

IN the preface to a brief biography of Erasmus written twenty-five years ago, the present reviewer ventured upon the following *dictum*: "A complete and satisfactory life of Erasmus of Rotterdam still remains to be written. Its author will have to be a thorough student of the classic literatures, a theologian familiar with every form of Christian speculation, a historian to whom the complicated movement of the Reformation is altogether intelligible, an educator, a moralist and a man of humor."

The appearance of Professor Smith's excellent book leaves this judgment as nearly true as it ever was, and this is said without any desire to detract from the value of this new contribution to the already voluminous Erasmian literature. It is repeated here rather to emphasize the inherent difficulty of the task Dr. Smith has undertaken. His preparation for the work has been long and varied. Since his *Life of Luther* published in 1911, he has been continuously engaged in studies of the Reformation period, and that means, of course, that he has been touching the life and work of Erasmus at many points. His command of the material has grown naturally with the progress of these studies, and he comes to the detailed examination of the Erasmian sources with an unusual breadth of bibliographical knowledge. His manner of presentation permits the display of this equipment at every step and gives to the reader the sense of security which can come from no other method.

In the interpretation of the often confusing and almost always slippery implications of the sources, Dr. Smith has naturally profited by the pioneer work of Mr. P. S. Allen in his monumental edition of the *Epistolae* and does not question the general implications of his guide. His judgments of Erasmus are, on the whole, such as every fair-minded student must reach who delves, however slightly or deeply, into the incredible mass of his intellectual product. His wide learning, his persistent diligence, his good humor except when crossed, his nervous sensitiveness to criticism, and his dread of committing himself to any opinion that might involve him in public controversy, are all perceived and sufficiently brought out. The consequences in the determination of his attitude toward the Reformation are shown at every stage.

But, after all, the life of Erasmus is in his writings. Apart from these he had no life worth recording. The chief test of an Erasmus biography is, therefore, to be sought in its treatment of the works by which his reputation was made and has been sustained. In this respect Dr. Smith's treatment is somewhat uneven. The *Enchiridion*, the earliest writing in which Erasmus declared his attitude toward the great question of religious sincerity in his day, is dismissed in a couple of pages, and the *Institutio Principis Christiani* in one page. The *Epistles*, the most important source of our information about their author, and certainly the most voluminous of his literary products, are given a brief analysis in two pages. On the other hand, the *Praise of Folly* occupies an entire chapter of ten pages and the *Colloquies* another of thirty-two. Perhaps this disparity may be justified by the extraordinary popularity of these two works. The analyses are well done, but would have gained in vividness by the use of more copious translation.

The account of the Greek Testament in 1516 and later, with its Latin version, is both informing and interesting. We could wish that much of the bibliographical material in connection with all these summaries of literature had been committed to notes and thus space released for matter more appealing to the general reader, for whom the volume is obviously intended. As it stands, however, it is an interesting book displaying at times unexpected vivacity and humor.

E. EMERTON.

L'Épanouissement de la Pensée Religieuse de Luther de 1515 à 1520.

Par HENRI STROHL, Docteur en Théologie, Maître de Conférences à la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de l'Université de Strasbourg. [Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses publiées par la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de l'Université de Strasbourg, fascicule 9.] (Strasbourg and Paris: Istra. 1924. Pp. 424. 18 fr.)

UNDER French auspices the University of Strasbourg devotes almost as much attention to evangelical theology and church history as it

formerly did in German hands. No less than three large books on Luther have now issued from the Faculté Protestante, two of which are from the pen of Dr. Strohl. Having devoted an earlier volume to tracing the religious evolution of Luther until 1515, the author now turns to the task of elucidating the Reformer's thought during the next five or six active years. For his subject he has enormous enthusiasm, happily transcending the bounds of nationality. For he thinks that this child of the people, this son of piety, still has much to say to "a turbulent epoch, in which the souls most in love with the absolute have seen, disillusioned, the shadows of the vast twilight descend upon a tired world, which has exhausted all its resources only to emerge finally at annihilation, at despair, and at disorder". For him the Saxon is still a prophet, speaking in the name of the living God, able to bring the world back to confidence, to give it an ideal and a reason for living. Since the time when Michelet lavished unstinted praises on the founder of Protestantism, no Frenchman has felt so much sympathy for the subject.

A large part of M. Strohl's work is exegesis of Luther's writings, particularly of his commentaries. Long slices of the lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, and of some of the tracts, and the whole of the Ninety-five Theses on Indulgences are translated and expounded. The pivot of the Reformer's thought is found in the *scholia* to Romans, iv. 7, a passage fraught with the message of distrust in the righteousness of works and with confidence in the healing power of God appropriated by faith. Closely bound up with the idea of the impotence of works is that of the sin of invincible concupiscence. So it was, reasoned Luther, that a man in the way of salvation must be "semper peccator, semper penitens, semper justus". Against the strong malady of original sin the Wittenberg professor found no effective medicine except the omnipotence of divine grace, and thus he laid for Calvin and other followers the foundations of the "high" doctrine of election and reprobation. At the basis of this theology M. Strohl is quite right in seeing a personal experience of its originator; but he is wrong, in the reviewer's judgment, in placing that experience as far back as 1513. Everything points to the summer of 1515 as a much more likely date for the famous "conversion".

After examining the foundations of his master's theology, the author proceeds to render careful account of the various phases of the professor's career at Wittenberg, and particularly of the controversy over indulgences. A summary history of the doctrine of indulgences from their first appearance in the Church opens the door to the comprehension of Luther's protest. Not only the Theses and the Resolutions written in their defense are thoroughly analyzed, but a tolerably large amount of space is given to the subsequent controversies with Emser, Döngersheim, Alfeld, and Prierias.

In the third section of the work the author studies the controversy over the Church that culminated in the debate with John Eck at Leipzig.

The most important results of this discussion are rightly seen in the denial of the papal supremacy and in the proclamation of the universal priesthood of all believers. On the other hand M. Strohl's treatment of Luther's notion of the sacrament disappoints the reader by its combined formalism and literalism. Though he has read diligently, he has no conception either of the portentous atmosphere of magic and miracle then surrounding the eucharist, like the electric field of force around a magnet, nor of the real glory of Luther's message in depriving the sacraments as rites of saving power and in placing their value entirely in the faith of the participant.

Under the title "The Apogee", the final chapter analyzes the tracts on *Christian Liberty* and on *Good Works*, and the *Manifesto to the German Nobility*. In this is included a valuable discussion of the Reformer's ideas of social betterment, both political and economic.

The outstanding merit of the book as a whole is its thoroughness. The author has read and assimilated all the German writings on the subject, and they are many. The defect of his qualities is that he is unoriginal. While he offers a good introduction to the subject for the beginner, there is little or nothing in his book which the scholar has not already read somewhere else. If we compare M. Strohl with Paul Kalkoff, who has devoted a lifetime to the study of just these years in the history of the Reformation, we must admit that Kalkoff has contributed a vast deal more to the understanding of the subject. In his little field he is a discoverer; his French rival is at best but an excellent *vulgarisateur*.

PRESERVED SMITH.

Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami, denuo recognitum et auctum per P. S. ALLEN, M.A., Collegii Mertonensis Socium Bibliothecarium, et H. M. ALLEN. Tomus V., 1522-1524. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. xxiii, 631. 26 s.)

IN this fifth volume of his masterly edition of the letters of Erasmus Mr. Allen shows the same qualities of conscientious accuracy and diligence to which we have paid tribute in previous numbers of this *Review*. There is nothing to add to our former expressions of admiration for the patience and courage with which he has faced the many difficulties of his colossal task. Like everyone else who has had to do with this enormous and often baffling literary product, he has felt the primary importance of establishing a firm chronological basis for his work. This once fixed, he has been able to fit into it the multitude of obscure references without doing too much violence to historical probability.

The present volume covers the correspondence of the years 1522 to 1524. Its special interest is the light it throws upon Erasmus's process of adjustment to the religious and political conditions following upon

the dramatic crisis of the year 1521. Throughout the whole volume with its nearly three hundred letters there runs the continuous thread of explanation and apology for the failure of the great man to commit himself on one side or the other of the world-shaking conflict, no longer impending but fully declared, between the old order and the new.

We find here the famous, if scanty, correspondence with Erasmus's compatriot and former academic friend, Pope Adrian VI., a man after the scholar's own heart, raised to the primacy by one of the proverbial swings of the papal pendulum, this time from the extravagant worldliness of the Medicean period to the simplicity and sincerity of the best papal tradition. Four letters from Erasmus and two from Adrian form this interesting cycle. In presenting his *editio princeps* of Arnobius's *Commentary on the Psalms* the writer congratulates the Christian world on having at its head so learned and so wise a guardian, disclaiming for himself any personal reward whatever, but predicting a speedy reconciliation of the warring factions, and incidentally warning the pope against unfavorable reports about himself which the *improbitas quorundam*—that persistent bogey of his imagination—would be sure to bring forward. In reply the pope assures him of his personal esteem and urges him to come to Rome as soon as convenient. Erasmus's answer consists mainly of his usual complaints and breaks off just at the point where he seemed about to give an opinion as to the sources of the present troubles and to suggest a remedy for them. Perhaps there was a "tag" intended only for the pope's private reading, but we may well doubt if it was anything more than the usual Erasmian formula: if only everyone were wise and good, all the complications would be solved at once. The only positive suggestion is one which occurs in other Erasmian writings: that an international conference of men "incorruptible, serious, moderate, trusted, and of calm judgment should be summoned, and that their decision should —"

Within this period falls also the correspondence with King Francis I. of France, in which Erasmus sets forth his well-known hopes for a warless world. "Cut out the roots of war, ambition for lands, for power and glory, and it would not be difficult for Christian princes to agree upon laws which would prevent these present disorders from breaking out again." There is a short French autograph letter from the king, reproduced in facsimile, containing a rather perfunctory assurance of welcome if Erasmus chooses to come to him.

Here occurs also the well-known passage-at-arms with Luther, in which the latter, writing with unusual restraint, begs Erasmus to refrain from bitter controversy with unimportant and extravagant defenders of the Reform, while Erasmus in his reply simply flies off into personal abuse and vague apology. There is much reference in many of these letters to preparations which Erasmus was making for his most important piece of controversial writing, the treatise on Freedom of the Will. This appeared in September, 1524, as announced in a letter of the sixth

to King Henry VIII. That it had any material effect either upon the course of events or upon the fortunes of the author does not appear.

A word should be said of the very beautiful reproductions of the Louvre and the Longford Holbein portraits.

E. EMERTON.

Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-upon-Avon and other Records, 1553-1620. Transcribed by RICHARD SAVAGE, with Introduction and Notes by EDGAR I. FRIPP. Volume II., 1566-1577. [Publications of the Dugdale Society, vol. III.] (London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. 1, 119. 21 s.)

Master Richard Quyny, Bailiff of Stratford-upon-Avon and Friend of William Shakespeare. By EDGAR I. FRIPP. (London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. 215.)

THESE two books are in the main contributions to a single object, the illustration of the social and economic conditions of Stratford-upon-Avon during the lifetime of William Shakespeare.

The volume of Stratford records covers the greater part of Shakespeare's boyhood, emphasizing the prominence of his father, John Shakespeare, at this time, and recording the active part which he took in the affairs of the borough. The method of handling the documents is the same as for volume I., which was reviewed in this periodical in July, 1922 (XXVII. 819 ff.). The outstanding features of the records are thoroughly and intelligently discussed in an introduction of forty pages, twenty-one of which are specifically devoted to John Shakespeare as alderman, bailiff, and head alderman, and the conditions surrounding the boy William in home, school, and shop. Seven additional pages discuss the reception accorded to plays and players in Stratford, and point out that Puritan opposition to them did not develop until a later date, "when the drama had lost, for the most part, its didactic aim and religious earnestness". While no important new facts are brought out concerning John Shakespeare or his greater son, it becomes increasingly clear from a study of the records as a whole that the conditions of life under which the future dramatist passed his boyhood were in no respect unfavorable to the development of his genius. His father was one of the foremost men of the borough, and by his official duties was brought into contact with men of education and knowledge of the world. Intercourse between Stratford and London was by no means infrequent, and it is a mistake to suppose that the ideas and impulses which were quickening life in the England of Elizabeth did not extend in full force to the town of Stratford.

Other important subjects discussed are the Queen of Scots and the Northern Rebellion, the Work of the Grand Commission Ecclesiastical, and the Oken Bequest. The last mentioned should be of interest to

students of industrial and economic history. It was a loan fund placed in the hands of the bailiff and alderman of Stratford for the purpose of aiding promising young craftsmen of the borough in establishing themselves in business.

The volume devoted to Master Richard Quyny is based not only upon the Stratford records but also upon a considerable number of unpublished letters, and sketches with considerable fullness of detail the life of a man intimately associated with the Shakespeares. Richard's father, Adrian, was the colleague and friend of Shakespeare's father. He himself was the poet's friend and correspondent, and his son Thomas married Shakespeare's younger daughter, Judith. Quyny was a man of affairs who received the same education William Shakespeare is supposed to have received in the Stratford Grammar School. It is significant of the opportunities of the young Shakespeare that Quyny's training in the classics was such as to enable him to read Latin easily, to conduct a correspondence with a friend who wrote largely in Latin, and apparently to cause him to take "Tully's *Epistles*" with him for entertainment when he went on a journey. No one, I think, can read Mr. Fripp's account of Master Richard Quyny without feeling confident that the social and educational opportunities of Stratford were far less meagre than has commonly been supposed. The book may be commended to all scholars who have been disturbed by Halliwell-Phillipps's pessimistic interpretation of the Stratford records.

Certain details of the records suggest some interesting speculations regarding a much discussed play. Scholars have long been puzzled by the presence in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* of elements which seem to belong, not to the background of Windsor, but to that of the Shakespeare district. This is not the time or the place to discuss the problem of the play, but I cannot forbear pointing out that a section of the borough of Stratford bore the name Windsor (later giving the name Windsor Street to what was once known as Hell Lane); that John Page appears in the records as concerned in a lawsuit with John Shakespeare and as lessee of property in Henley Street and in Windsor; that although no Master Ford appears in the records, Roger Brooke and William Brookes do appear; that the town had a number of Welsh citizens, including one named Evans; that the master of the Stratford Grammar School in 1576, when William Shakespeare was a boy of twelve, was an Oxford graduate, Thomas Jenkins, a Welshman who has been plausibly conjectured to have been the prototype of Sir Hugh Evans; that Robert Shallow, Esquire, and his entourage clearly belonged to the neighboring Gloucestershire; and that John Rugby is a name more appropriate to the neighborhood of Stratford than to that of Windsor; and finally that the name "Horne" was not unknown to Stratford, Margery, the widow of Laurence Horne of Bishopton, being admitted to the Stratford almshouse in 1575-1576. (It will be remembered that the Quarto has "Horne, the hunter" where the Folio has "Herne".) I am not yet

ready to suggest that in the earliest version of *The Merry Wives* the scene was laid in Stratford and later transferred to the better known Windsor, but the curious details just recorded would seem to justify an inquiry into this possibility.

JOHN M. MANLY.

A History of the Tory Party, 1640-1714. By KEITH FEILING.
(Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. 525. 18 s.)

It is a pleasure to welcome the appearance of Mr. Feiling's book. The history of the two great English parties has needed writing; for Cooke's *History of Parties* has been out of date, as well as out of print, for many years, and Mr. Kent's *Early History of the Tory Party* scarcely meets the requirements of many scholars. Nor, were these two volumes and the monographs on other phases of party history more adequate and more numerous, would they invalidate this careful study of the eventful years between 1640 and 1714 which Mr. Feiling has given us, for, apart from the actual history of the party itself, he has included material which will seem to some readers more interesting if not more valuable than even his narrative. That portion of his book which he calls "Origins", and which covers the period between the accession of Elizabeth and the accession of Charles II., dealing as it does with the political topography and the political theory which underlay the parties, is peculiarly significant and informing. The chapter on the Cavaliers, like that on the Civil War and the exiles, the former in particular, breathes the very spirit of the old, lost cause. It is like the refrain of an old song—indeed, it actually contains an extraordinary number of old songs. It embodies the whole Cavalier school of literature, and more. It is at once a eulogy and an epitaph of "this great party—massing so much talent and devotion, and reaching back so far to the past"—which "laid hearts, brains, and lives as offerings" in the hands of the Stuart kings.

Thus introduced, Mr. Feiling takes up his narrative of what happened to this great party, through the administrations of Clarendon and the Cabal and Danby, the Popish Plot and the Revolution, the reigns of William and Mary and of Anne, to the Great Ministry of 1710-1714. Always with the same literary charm, the same wealth of quotation and allusion, the infinite details drawn from memoirs and letters and pamphlets, it makes good reading. It will be received unquestionably as the great work on the subject; it will rightly be praised in high, and possibly, here and there, in extravagant terms. It will deserve much of that praise, for it represents a high level of literary scholarship and achievement. It is unquestionably the greatest single contribution yet made to our knowledge and our understanding of its subject.

In so far as the material on which it is based is concerned, there will perhaps be no need for anyone else to go over it. Yet there are at least

two fields which must still be explored before we shall have a true picture of what actually was and what actually happened. The one is the financial development in the years of which he treats, and its connection with politics. The subject is obscure; it has not been worked out; it is difficult to trace. Yet it is as important to know who held shares in the old and new East India companies, or in the Bank, or in the South Sea Company as it is to know who had pensions and places from the court. It is impossible to appreciate the position of Harley—to take one instance—without an understanding of finance, or even “business” in this period. One looks in vain in these pages for the names of Blackwell or of Child. He finds one sentence relating to the formation of the South Sea Company, and not much more relating to the other great enterprises. And we must know much more than we do now to evaluate properly the springs of interest and action behind the intrigues of politicians in this period.

The other field is that of what one may call mass-politics. The struggles, the ambitions, the rivalries, and alliances of leaders must always attract more attention than the way their followers voted. Yet if we explain fully the developments of politics we must take account of followers as well as of leaders, of divisions as well as of speeches, of machinery as well as of opinion, of masses as well as of personalities. This, like the questions of finance, means long and tedious research in sources very different from memoirs and letters, it means such calculations and tabulations as astute leaders once made for themselves. It means research rather than reading and reflection. It may be regarded by some as beneath that fabled dignity of history which has obscured much truth.

This is beyond the scope of such work as that of Mr. Feiling; and though we shall not arrive at the bottom of the well at which, we have been told, truth lies—even the truth of politics—until we have these facts, we may be grateful meanwhile for this admirable and entertaining book. It is a long step on the way to the history of political parties.

WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

R + P *Europe since 1789.* By EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER, Professor of European History in the University of Michigan. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page, and Company. 1924. Pp. xvi, 846. \$3.50.)

THIS volume is an enlargement and revision of Professor Turner's *Europe, 1789-1920*, which appeared three years ago. Two new chapters have been added, Problems after the War and the European Countries after the War, and a more extended treatment has been accorded to various topics, the additions totalling 148 pages. He has also omitted with good reason chapter II. in the edition of 1920 entitled “Separation of the Communities in America”; for the matter in this chapter was not strictly pertinent to his theme. The space thus saved has been utilized

for a fuller and much more satisfactory account of the French Revolution.

With the exceptions just noted the two books are substantially the same in contents, organization, and phraseology. Both trace in main outline the development of the European states from the French Revolution to the present time, their internal political changes, their international relations, the progress of democracy, nationalism, and national imperialism, the most significant advances in scholarship, science, and invention. The World War receives adequate treatment and, in presenting its causes, Professor Turner takes account of the large collections of documents relating to that subject which have been published since 1920. The author is unbiassed and dispassionate at all times and aims with meticulous care to hold with exact balance the scales of justice. In this respect he is quite different from Professor Hayes, whose inborn enthusiasm, combined with his forceful and vivacious style, makes him appear too often as a partizan or advocate, praising or condemning, if not in terms, at least by innuendo and sarcasm.

It may be that Professor Turner's zeal to achieve exact justice in statement hampers him somewhat in the work of composition; for an author of his experience should be able to write better English. His sentences are often awkward in construction, his diction often jejune, or unsuited to his theme, and his style in general conveys often an impression of feebleness and affectation. The following sentence, in which he undertakes to define evolution, illustrates in part his literary defects, though it certainly has the merit of comprehensiveness: "Furthermore, the very idea of creation, or sudden making of things, was slowly displaced by the idea that things had evolved out of other things by slow changes through long process of time" (p. 783). After reading a few score of such sentences one yearns for some vigorous, straightforward, clean-cut English.

The organization of material and the sequence of chapters is logical, except in the case of chapter XXIX., the last in the book. This is entitled "Social and Intellectual Changes", and seems out of place, almost like an afterthought, or a receptacle for facts not fitted elsewhere into the general scheme of organization. After finishing with the conditions produced by the World War, the author turns back to such subjects as Copernicus, Buffon, and Lyell, to certain results of the French Revolution, and to the papacy in the nineteenth century, closing with the Conference at the Hague in 1907. The reader is led irresistibly to the inference that there have been no social or intellectual developments in Europe since that date. In his *Europe since 1870* Professor Turner gives fourth place to a chapter having the same title and much the same contents.

After every abatement has been made for trifling defects, however, this book remains a sound, substantial, useful piece of work, well adapted to the needs of classes which are studying Europe in the nineteenth and

twentieth centuries. Its material is well selected and it is nowhere overloaded with needless detail. It contains forty-five maps, thirteen of them new and four in colors.

E. E. SPERRY.

The Manuscript of St. Helena. Translated by WILLARD PARKER. (New York and London: D. Appleton and Company. 1924. Pp. xiii, 152. \$2.00.)

THE *Manuscrit venu de Sainte-Hélène d'une Manière Inconnue*, as the original title reads, purports to be a succinct autobiographic account by Napoleon I. of the events of his reign, a sort of political testament from his own hand: "Je donne le précis de ces événements, parce que mon caractère et mes intentions peuvent être étrangement défigurés, et je tiens à paraître tel que j'ai été, aux yeux de mon fils, comme à ceux de la postérité", concludes the first paragraph.

The translator-editor of this new English edition appears to believe in good faith that he had before him the authentic copy brought in 1817 to England and finally after eighty years of unknown wanderings to Elwood, New Jersey: "During the 'nineties two ladies . . . came from 'somewhere' and set up a modest housekeeping ménage in Elwood"; departing for an unknown destination about 1907 and never heard of again, they left among their effects the Manuscript of St. Helena. In his introduction the translator remarks: "Until now the reader of English has never had an opportunity to read of . . . the Great Corsican as photographed by himself . . . a small French edition [of the Manuscript] was struck off by an English publisher in . . . 1817 . . . An English translation however was never issued." He ends with the conclusion that "of the genuineness of the Manuscript there can be no possible doubt. In [his] Testament made in 1820 . . . Napoleon says 'I disavow the Manuscript of St. Helena' . . . this disavowal forms a most positive proof of the genuineness of the document".

In the light of the facts noted below, it appears that persons with naïve dispositions—and a penchant for apocryphal documents—take risks in writing prefaces to manuscripts brought from "somewhere". The translation, from a cursory inspection, is fair—no better, if no worse, than the earlier ones of London and New York, 1817.

The *Manuscrit venu de Sainte-Hélène* was first published by John Murray, London, April 30, 1817, and has been republished in many editions and under different titles, and in translations in many languages. A copy of the Murray edition was brought to Napoleon at St. Helena on September 5, 1817, by Montholon, with whom and others Napoleon discussed the work off and on, as reported by General Gourgaud in his *Journal*.¹ Forty-four critical notes to the work, made by Napoleon, were

¹ Général Baron [Gaspard] Gourgaud, *Sainte-Hélène; Journal inédit de 1815 à 1818* . . . (Paris, E. Flammarion, 1899, 2 vols.). Cf. vol. II., pp. 230 ff.

published later repeatedly.² Napoleon, however, declined to name the person whom he believed to be the author. The authorship was variously ascribed to Benjamin Constant, to E. J. Sieyès, to Mme. de Stael, and to a "M. Bertrand, ancien officier au régiment de la Vistule, so-disant parent de M. Siméon". In 1841 after the death on September 24 of Jacob Frédéric Lullin de Châteauevieux, of Geneva, a copy of the *Manuscrit* was found among his literary remains bearing a declaration of his authorship.³ That Lullin de Châteauevieux, distinguished as the author of *Lettres écrites d'Italie* (1816), *Lettres de Saint-James* (1820-1826), and other notable works, was also the author of the *Manuscrit venu de Sainte-Hélène* has not since been questioned. A keen observer and a fine mind, he followed closely the intricate political movements of the time, into which his manifold relations with the leaders who played the principal rôles permitted him to gain a wonderful insight. He was therefore well equipped for venturing the *tour de force* of writing the exile's professed own apology of his life, the exposition of his projects and views, and above all to give expression to his contempt for the human species. But however well he had succeeded in putting himself in the broken emperor's place, in adopting his ideas, and, in a fashion, his style, it was not long before numerous anachronisms and opinions which could not possibly have belonged to the emperor were being detected and demonstrated by competent critics,⁴ independent of the emperor's own strictures already referred to.

Simultaneously with the French edition there appeared an English translation also published by Murray (London, 1817), and the Library of Congress has a New York edition, by Van Winkle and Wiley, with copyright notice dated May 26, 1817. There appears to have been a Pittsburgh edition also dated 1817, printed by Robert Patterson, under the title *Napoleon's Own Memoirs printed from a Manuscript transmitted from St. Helena by an Unknown Channel*. The Pittsburgh edition was destroyed by fire in the printer's shop, but at least one set of proof-sheets or an advance copy escaped, which is in the possession of Mr. G. R. Tuite, Los Angeles, California, who presented to the Library of Congress a photograph of the title-page. A story of how a groom of the emperor's stable at St. Helena (the younger Archambault) was entrusted with the manuscript by Napoleon, to carry it to Joseph Bonaparte at Bordentown, is told by John Brisben Walker in the *Cosmopolitan*, August, 1898 (XXV. 440-447). The article is full of inaccuracies and omissions of facts, which make the entire account misleading. There can be no doubt of the spuriousness of the *Manuscrit venu de Sainte-Hélène*, so far as Napoleon's authorship is concerned.

² *Le Manuscrit de Sainte-Hélène, publié pour la première fois avec des Notes par Napoléon*, edited by General Gourgaud (Paris, 1821), reproduced in *Correspondance de Napoléon I.*, XXXI. 226-241.

³ *Journal des Débats*, Oct. 7, 1841, p. 3.

⁴ *Le "Manuscrit venu de Sainte-Hélène" apprécié à sa juste Valeur* (Paris, Louis Gabriel Michaud, 1817).

The Library of Congress has in its possession, besides several of the printed editions and translations, a French manuscript copy of the original, undated, but probably of or close to 1817. It appears that there are in existence a number of such manuscript copies—the prompt suppression by the French government of the publication of the *Manuscrit* by Comte and Dunoyer in the *Censeur Européen* (t. 3, 1817, pp. 9–192) may well account for its circulation in manuscript form, less easily reached by the agents of the censor.

CHARLES MARTEL.

Le Comte Molé, 1781–1855: sa Vie, ses Mémoires. Par le Marquis de NOAILLES. Tome troisième. (Paris: Édouard Champion. 1924. Pp. 467. 20 fr.)

MATHIEU LOUIS, Count Molé, came of an important judicial family which could trace its rôle back to the fifteenth century and which contributed, generation after generation, an uninterrupted line of magistrates to France. His father, like his predecessors in the headship of the family, continued this long-established tradition. As president of the Parlement of Paris he encountered the fierce blasts of the French Revolution and as a conspicuous representative of an unpopular class met his death on the scaffold in April, 1794. The son, then thirteen years of age, became in time a member of the Council of State under Napoleon, a judge, a minister of justice; under the Restoration a minister of the navy; in 1830 minister of foreign affairs, in 1836 head of the government. He lived to be seventy-four years old, although his health was always of the poorest, he himself having estimated methodically the number of days in his lifetime when he had been without pain and having found that they would not fill a month all told. But with what always seemed a precarious hold on life he not only managed to accomplish a vast amount of varied and useful public service, but in addition he composed an account of his activities which, now in process of publication, seems certain to place him among the great memoir-writers of France.

In the politics of his time Molé was a personage of the first order, and, as he was intimately associated with affairs, as he saw everything, knew everything that was going on, was acquainted with all the secret wires and pulleys and springs that were in use in the political game, and as he was a keen political observer, endowed with a literary gift of a high quality, he was admirably equipped to describe the men and measures of his epoch, to the great advantage of posterity. This he has done on a liberal scale, for Molé enters into the minutiae of history, the significant not the trivial minutiae. The result is a tapestry tightly woven, where every thread and knot serves a purpose, and the crowded scene portrayed is full of movement and of color, animated, lifelike, durable.

The third volume of these notable memoirs covers the period from May, 1817, to September, 1818. It presents mainly the inner history of

the final year of the Richelieu ministry, which Molé chronicles with a completeness and a realism hardly to be found elsewhere. The chief measures of the ministry, their reaction upon the parliament and upon the ministry itself, Molé's own suggestions, proposals, and speeches, and the personal and party manoeuvres that furthered or that balked the work of the king's government in a turbid time, all are set forth adequately and illuminatingly. The habits and customs of the world of politics, of the world of society, some of them passing strange, are revealed from many angles and in various lights. Among many excellencies Molé excels supremely as a painter of living portraits. Here he reminds us in some ways of Saint Simon. It is a remarkable gallery of varied types that this extremely penetrating psychologist exposes for our contemplation, Louis XVIII., Monsieur, the Duke of Angoulême, the Duc de Richelieu, Decazes, Pozzo, Pasquier, Lainé, Gouvion, Wellington, Castlereagh, Royer-Collard, and many more, including Count Molé himself.

This volume is an astonishing study of political intrigues. It is a record of the process of dissolution of the Richelieu ministry, never a happy band, and sapped and mined in its closing months, not only by its avowed enemies, but by the ambitions, the treacheries, the dislikes, the insincerities of its own members. We see portrayed here the art of dissimulation and the allied art of dissimulating dissimulation. Few of the seamy sides of human nature are missing and, where they are for the moment absent, mere folly or mere ignorance fills out the story, which is entertaining, if not edifying. The memory of so many miserable intrigues, of so much baseness of character and conduct ends by disgusting and disheartening the memoirist, who announces that he has no courage to continue and that he wishes to suspend the narrative—only for a while, no doubt.

Molé in these volumes reveals himself with great frankness and sincerity. There is some talk, though not much, of literature and the fine arts and now and then a memorable passage showing Molé's intense love of nature, or giving a discreet and melancholy account of some adventure in the realm of sentiment. "I am writing my life", he says, "as I have lived it. Let not the reader seek in these memoirs either transition, or method, or continuity. Let him rather seek abrupt, unexpected contrasts and strange incongruities." Being a man of distinguished birth and breeding, Molé has no trace of pedantry. He writes as such a person would. The result is most agreeable reading.

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

Von Bismarck zum Weltkriege: die Deutsche Politik in den Jahrzehnten vor dem Kriege. Dargestellt auf Grund der Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes von ERICH BRANDENBURG. (Berlin: Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte. 1924. Pp. x, 454.)

THIS volume is unique in being the first history of the post-Bismarckian period to be written with a full acquaintance with all the documents of the German Foreign Office. Brandenburg, who finished his volume a couple of years ago, used these in manuscript, before the publication *Die Grosse Politik* had reached the period with which he deals. As volumes VII. to XVIII. of the latter are now available, covering German foreign policy from 1890 to 1904, it is interesting to check up Brandenburg by the documents, and, *vice versa*, to test the honesty of the editors of *Die Grosse Politik* by comparing their selection of documents with Brandenburg's narrative. He cites some documents which they omit, and they naturally print in their ten large volumes a mass of material which he has no space even to summarize. So far, however, as I have been able to compare them, there is a reassuring congruity in the two works—no *suppressio veri* or *suggestio falsi* in either. There are minor differences of emphasis here and there. But if Brandenburg's interpretation of the years 1904–1914 reflects the documents as accurately as does his account of the fourteen preceding years, I venture to think that the future volumes of *Die Grosse Politik* will not substantially modify the masterly exposition and criticism of German foreign policy which he has here set forth.

The great merit of Brandenburg's work is that it is written directly from the Foreign Office archives. Despatches to and from ambassadors, and the Kaiser's marginalia, are often quoted *verbatim* as well as summarized. Scores of obscure or unknown episodes are now for the first time made clear as daylight. At some points the Kaiser appears much more to blame for blunders than has hitherto been supposed; at other points much less so. Holstein is fully as malign an influence as he is painted in Mr. Gooch's admirable essay. Bülow and Kiderlen-Wächter are revealed to be much more naïve, adventurous, and short-sighted than they have led posterity to believe; it appears that they did not always tell the Kaiser the full truth. But the merit of Brandenburg's work is also its defect. He takes virtually no note of any material except what is in the German Foreign Office archives. His orientation is exclusively that of the Wilhelmstrasse. But this does not mean that he sees only the German side of the case. He is too good a historian for that. In the keen analysis of motives with which he closes every chapter, he does not hesitate to score severely those moves on the European chess-board which ultimately involved disaster.

In the years immediately following Bismarck's dismissal Germany still enjoyed the prestige and superior international position which he

had given her. Even the formation of the Franco-Russian alliance did not at first endanger her, so long as England stood aloof. But by 1898, England, or at least Joseph Chamberlain, had come to the conclusion that "splendid isolation" was no longer desirable. Thrice within the next three years England offered Germany an alliance. In each case Germany made the great mistake of neglecting the offer. Her motives were various: Holstein's conviction that England would always come forward again with more generous offers; the Kaiser's anti-English "complex" and his constant dream of a "Continental league" to be composed of the five great powers comprising the Triple Alliance and Franco-Russian Alliance; suspicion as to England's sincerity and disappointment that no tangible results had come from the Anglo-German treaty in regard to the Portuguese colonies; the fear of antagonizing Russia; and, finally, the friction arising from constant haggling with England over picayune colonial matters. As Germany persistently neglected to grasp the proffered hand, England quite naturally did what Holstein thought impossible but what German ambassadors in London constantly warned would happen: England turned to France and eventually to Russia. By her short-sightedness and her seeking after petty gains, Germany let slip the favorable moment for securing the invincible combination of British naval power and German military power.

The Tangier episode is clearly shown to have been a policy forced upon the Kaiser by Holstein and Bülow. The Kaiser had always been relatively indifferent to Morocco. He had decisively vetoed the desire of his Foreign Office to seek a piece of Moroccan territory as Germany's compensation for allowing France to dominate the Moroccan interior. But Bülow played upon his vanity to persuade him that his landing at Tangier would add to German prestige, and would make France realize that she could not swallow Morocco without consulting Germany. How unwillingly the Kaiser accepted the rôle thrust upon him is seen from his telegram to Bülow while on his way to Tangier, saying that it was very doubtful whether he would land after all, and in any case only as a tourist and without any official reception. But Bülow telegraphed back that this was quite impossible; that all the public arrangements had been made, and that, if they were not carried out, it would look as if the Kaiser had been frightened out of his intentions by the French. So the Kaiser yielded to his chancellor. His speech at Tangier had exactly the opposite effect of that desired; it antagonized France and England and ultimately strengthened the growing Anglo-French entente. Yet it might have been turned to good account. France at first was seriously embarrassed by the German demonstration on behalf of the sultan. Rouvier hastened to intimate to Bülow that France was ready in return for a free hand in Morocco to come to a friendly agreement on all colonial questions, similar to the Anglo-French entente. Bülow, however, did not take up the offer and kept it concealed for two years from the Kaiser. He wanted to humiliate France by forcing Delcassé's resig-

nation, foolishly thinking that, when France was once shown how weak she was, she would be more tractable.

In the Björkö affair, on the other hand, the Kaiser acted somewhat independently of his chancellor. In meeting "Nicky" at Björkö, "Willy" had apparently not intended at first to impose a treaty upon his weak friend. It was only the day before the meeting that he telegraphed to Berlin for the text of the treaty which he had vainly urged upon the Tsar the previous year. At the last moment, without consulting Bülow, he modified one paragraph so that Germany was obligated to defend Russian interests only "in Europe". This was a modification distinctly to Germany's advantage. But Bülow, upon hearing of it, handed in his resignation. He pretended he could not continue to be responsible for Germany's foreign policy, if the Kaiser was to take such decisions without consulting him. The Kaiser was in despair and besought him to remain in office. Bülow agreed to do so after he had succeeded in his purpose of getting a stronger grip on the Kaiser and the German Foreign Office. He then went ahead with his unfortunate Algeciras policy.

After 1907 the Triple Entente became steadily stronger while the Triple Alliance grew steadily weaker. As Italy and Rumania could not be counted upon with certainty, Germany had no real ally but Austria. Austria, realizing that Germany could not afford to throw her over, became more reckless in her Balkan policy. In annexing Bosnia in 1908, she faced not only Europe, but her own ally, with a *fait accompli*. William II., who did not hear of it until the day the annexation was proclaimed, was very angry at Aehrenthal's duplicity. He feared it might lead to a general carving up of Turkey, to Russian resentment, and possibly to a European war. In the end, however, he allowed himself to be persuaded by Bülow that Austria must be fully supported in the Bosnian crisis which followed. This was a dangerous precedent for 1914.

In summing up, Brandenburg concludes that German policy may be reproached with short-sightedness, vacillation, and swinging of the big stick, but that at no time did Germany want war or work for it. If she had wanted war there were many earlier occasions more favorable for her than 1914; her policy was too timid rather than too warlike. Moreover, Germany had more to lose than to gain by a European war. England, likewise, he believes, sincerely strove for peace, though disquieted by Germany's naval policy and refusal to accept any agreement for limiting the insane race in the building of war-ships. In France and Russia also the mass of the people were for peace. But in both these countries there was a small war party, headed by Poincaré and Izvolski, who worked for war as they saw the increasing superiority of the Triple Entente forces over those of the Central Powers. They aimed at goals—Alsace-Lorraine and the control of the Balkans and the Straits—which could only be won by war. They were willing to accept the risk to reach the goal. And they were aided by the new force of

nationalism which was working inevitably to destroy the anachronistic Danubian state, which Bismarck had chosen as Germany's ally, but which he had also said could not wisely be regarded always as a sure foundation in a changing future.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

Souvenirs Vécus—Quelques Feuilles de l'Histoire Coloniale: Les Rivalités Internationales. Par le Colonel P.-L. MONTEIL. Préface de Monsieur le Général MANGIN. (Paris: Société d'Éditions Géographiques Maritimes et Coloniales. 1924. Pp. 157.)

THIS little work has been long looked for by students of colonial expansion in general, and more particularly by the few who watch with surprise and admiration the new African empire under the Tricolor. Colonel Monteil is the father of his colonial country, so far as the new France is concerned. When all others were indifferent, he persistently preached in favor of developing Algeria towards Morocco and linking the Niger with Mediterranean ports by way of the great desert.

Alone in 1892 he accomplished the greatest feat of peaceful penetration ever attempted in modern times—nothing less than leading a party of ten men successfully and without serious bloodshed all the way from Senegal and Lake Tchad to Tripoli. I say advisedly the “greatest feat”, for it is by the relation of means to ends that we must measure the effort. This is no disparagement to other great names of modern times—Lugard, Johnston, Selous, Peary, Livingstone, and above all Stanley. The history of modern exploration is rich in daring, but no page of it records an achievement more complete by means almost hopelessly inadequate. Stanley left a trail of bloody carcasses—Monteil a trail of living allies.

On returning from this venture, his government sent him on a diplomatic mission to Berlin—another forlorn hope. He was then captain of marine artillery—a handsome young soldier entering upon a diplomatic duel in which a Teuton giant smiled superciliously upon the champion of a country it regarded as hopelessly exhausted.

Monteil tells modestly how for weary weeks he faced the then almighty minister Marschall von Bieberstein and his associates; how at one time the negotiations were broken off; how Germany insisted upon her own frontiers in Africa and scouted the claims of her weaker neighbor; and how at the last moment, for interesting reasons, the Kaiser himself intervened and the gallant young captain triumphed.

It makes a stirring chapter, this first diplomatic triumph of a nation barely recovering from the effects of Sedan and Metz. No wonder that Monteil became the popular hero!

The Kaiser also might have then paved the way for a Franco-German understanding had he—but that is a digression!

Monteil discusses William II. and finds a clue to the causes of the Great War in an obsession regarding England. In his view this madness commenced soon after mounting the throne and became with years more intense. It went so far in 1894 as to propose an anti-British treaty between the French and German colonies!

There are many interesting chapters in this little book, all of them reflecting the mature opinion of one who lived the scenes that he depicts; who gives history at first hand or at least repeats what he has learned from trustworthy sources.

Perhaps the most startling feature of Monteil's book is the chapter commencing at page 135, which lays bare the nearly successful negotiations by which William II. was to have a naval base in the Mediterranean and thus menace England's road by the Suez Canal to India.

We cannot criticize this book of Colonel Monteil, save on the score of size—it should be larger! It deserves a place on the shelves of those who form their opinion scientifically. Little by little we shall doubtless have light upon the devious methods by which imperial Germany prepared for a campaign whose ultimate result was to have made Calcutta and Bombay terminals of the Berlin-Bagdad railway. So long as a Hohenzollern has hopes of ruling, German mémoires must be read with caution; the more precious therefore such a luminous ray of personal reflection as the volume which has inspired these few lines.

POULTNEY BIGELOW.

Pt R¹⁴

The Naval History of the World War: Offensive Operations, 1914-1915. By THOMAS G. FROTHINGHAM, Captain, U. S. R. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1924. Pp. xi, 349, with maps and diagrams. \$3.75.)

THE first volume of this work by Captain Frothingham, whose previous studies in military history have found favor with historians and strategists, deals with naval operations from the beginning of the war to the decisive defeat of the purely naval attack on the Dardanelles in March, 1915. It does not err on the side of timidity. Evidently assuming that a period of six years has been sufficient to allow the publication of all official reports and personal narratives of participants in the great drama that are important, and that he is therefore in possession of the essential facts from which a just and clear perspective can be attained, the author does not scruple to apportion either blame or praise, though his tone is rather censorious than eulogistic. It may be that, having, in the nature of things, to study closely and to quote widely the *Naval Operations* of the late Sir Julian Corbett, he has been contrarily affected by the apologetic tone of that otherwise splendid work. Since this undertaking of Captain Frothingham is the first of its kind, namely, a purely naval history of the entire war, its fearless outspokenness is to be welcomed. One feels that the author has no personal ax to grind, as was

Frothingham: Naval History of the World War 367

inevitable in the cases of the personal narratives of the leaders in the war, which were bound to be more or less apologetic.

The author lays stress upon and brings out clearly the following points in particular: the neglect on Germany's part to use her fleet to best advantage in the opening stages of the war; the collapse of the "dry-land" plan of campaign; the inability on the part of Great Britain to grasp the real naval objectives at the start; Great Britain's mistake in adopting a defensive policy at sea; the mistake of leaving the chance of the *Goeben's* flight to Constantinople in existence; the futility of Lord Fisher's "Baltic Plan"; the battles of Coronel and the Falkland Islands; and the failure of the naval attack on the Dardanelles.

In reading the author's unsparing condemnation of the traditional "dry-land" plan of attack upon France, and his wonder that the Germans failed to hamper in any effective way the development of the British naval plans, including the transportation of the first military contingent to France, one gathers that, in his opinion, this tacit acknowledgment by Germany of inability to embarrass Britain by sea and the former's consequent comparative quiescence at the start were more or less to blame for the failure of the German armies in early September, for he says (p. 15): "The narrow margin of final defeat made every factor of importance. The Germans, on their part, have made an excuse for their defeat the fact that two army corps and a cavalry division were diverted from the crisis of the campaign as a reinforcement against the Russian invasion of East Prussia. The fact that Sea Power had added exactly this amount to the ranks of their enemies, by the British Expeditionary Force alone, must be considered equally important, following the German line of argument."

But, remembering this "narrow margin of final defeat", is it not fair to ask what might have happened if the Schlieffen "dry-land" plan had been fully carried out and the detached two army corps and the division had been there to face the Allies when, as Mr. Churchill put it, "the nerve of the German Headquarters failed"? The detached corps did make that difference in the problem, as Captain Frothingham says, and if they had been retained the Germans would have been that much stronger, possibly triumphantly so, in spite of the failure to stop the British crossing of the Channel. "Paris might have fallen", says the Director of Intelligence, Captain McNamee (*Naval Institute Proceedings* for September, 1924, p. 1446). Paris might or might not have fallen at that time, but a much more important thing might well have happened, namely, the breaking of the French front between Paris and Verdun or the falling heavily upon its rear from the direction of Nancy, which would have resulted in the cutting off of nearly half the French army in the Verdun angle, after which the capture of Paris and no doubt that of the Channel ports, which our author charges them severely with neglecting, would have been easy for the Germans. The

facts are simple. Whether or not the Germans might have strengthened themselves by greater initial naval activity, or the capture of Paris or the Channel ports, there was one thing of which they were sure, and correctly so, namely, the transcendent necessity of smashing the French army, and compared with that all else was insignificant. Had they broken the French line as planned the world might now be lauding the Schlieffen plan.

Our author quotes many passages from the despatches of Sir John (now Lord) Jellicoe expressing anxiety as to the enemy's possible offensive operations with mines, submarines, and otherwise, including the phrase "the small margin of superiority which we possessed over the German Fleet" as compared with the naval responsibilities of the two forces, and also from the writings of Sir Julian Corbett, the apologist for the British commander, and says (p. 73), "This reasoning of the British historian, even in a book written after the war, shows the persistence of the invasion idea as an influence on British strategy".

Describing the battle of Coronel, Captain Frothingham blames Admiral Cradock for fighting under the existing conditions, and especially because he did not wait until the *Canopus* had joined, when the British force would have been one "Admiral Spee could not have stood up against". This is, of course, a very disputable point. Mr. Churchill in his *World Crisis* (I. 449) is of like opinion: "With the *Canopus* Admiral Cradock's squadron was safe." In view of the facts that *Canopus* could not exceed twelve knots, that *Good Hope*, with like armor, was riddled by the 8-inch guns of von Spee, and that *Canopus* carried guns of an antiquated mark (only 35 calibres) which were quite outranged by von Spee's eights in *Scharnhorst* and *Gneisenau*, it seems very certain that Mr. Churchill's "citadel", as he called *Canopus*, would have rapidly followed the rest of Cradock's ships to the bottom of the sea. Knowing that he could not obey the Admiralty's orders to search for and bring the German cruisers to action, if hampered with a 12-knot ship, Cradock did the best he could. The responsibility rests with London, not with him.

Our author's description of the Coronel action, as well as of that off the Falklands, is very spirited and clear, and so is his analysis of the incredible neglect on the part of the British and French to grasp the importance of the Dardanelles, and the almost inevitable failure of the purely naval attacks upon their defenses.

The volume is marred by an apparent lack of care, as instanced by the printing of the word "Leipsig" in the text, while it is spelled correctly (*Leipzig*) on the maps. It is to be hoped that a bibliography will be supplied with the volumes to come. The maps are excellent.

EDWARD BRECK.

A History of the Peace Conference of Paris. Edited by H. W. V.

TEMPERLEY. [Published under the auspices of the British Institute of International Affairs.] Volume VI. (London: Henry Frowde, and Hodder and Stoughton. 1924. Pp. xxxi, 709. £2 2s.; £10 10s. for the set.)

THIS is the final volume of the impressive history, planned during the Peace Conference itself, and now brought to successful conclusion within five years of its inception. Whether we judge it by the skill displayed in the arrangement of material, or by the editor's sense of proportion, or by the tone of the contributors, the volume attains the level established by its predecessors. In view of the difficulties that had to be met, this is high praise. The overcaptious critic may discover in it certain defects similar to those of the earlier volumes. It is necessarily a survey, and exigencies of space forbid the detailed treatment which specialists in the various fields would appreciate; it is not entirely free from repetition; reference to preceding volumes is necessary to catch the bearing of certain chapters; it does not bring to an ordered conclusion the various topics it treats. But such are the inevitable defects of a comprehensive, collaborative history of contemporary events, and the student may well be grateful that they have been minimized by the ability of the editor and contributors.

The scope of the volume is broad, for it covers the peace settlement in Turkey and in eastern and northern Europe, and it includes chapters upon the British Dominions, the Far East, and the League of Nations. Following the plan already laid down, the historical setting of each problem is briefly outlined (in the case of Poland, Professor Lord has contributed a separate historical sketch); there follows a description of its treatment at the Peace Conference, and in most cases a short narrative that brings the story well into the year 1922 and in certain cases into 1923. The first and longest chapter, about a third of the entire volume apart from appendixes, is devoted to the Near and Middle East. It provides a summary sketch of the four important secret agreements concluded during the war; the student will regret its brevity, which was doubtless necessary, and especially the omission of the text of the Saint Jean de Maurienne Agreement, which many hoped could now be published. This section is succeeded by a description of the attempts made at Paris and after to find a solution for the problem of conflicting claims, and the embarrassing position of the Powers which resulted from the nationalist movements they had encouraged during the war. It includes a consideration of the breakdown of the Treaty of Sèvres, Arab nationalism in connection with the problems of Syria, Palestine, and Mesopotamia, the independence of Egypt, the question of Persia. A large portion of this chapter is naturally devoted to developments subsequent to the Peace Conference. In the case of the following chapter on Poland, emphasis has been placed upon the ideas and the discussions of

the peace delegates at Paris, for here, as the editor points out, "it is the origin of those ideas and their interpretation in the Treaties which is of greatest importance". The success of the Polish experiment, for the moment at least, and the bankruptcy of the Treaty of Sèvres he attributes to the willingness of the Great Powers in the one case and their unwillingness in the other to reach agreement and to enforce their views. There is strong support for this conclusion in the text of the two chapters.

The chapter that deals with the Russian problem is comparatively brief, covering very properly merely the establishment and recognition of the Baltic states and the relations of Bolshevik Russia with the Allied Powers. The internal aspects of Bolshevism naturally are not treated. The sketch of the failure of the Peace Conference and the Supreme Council of the Allies during the two years that followed the Conference, summary though it is, sets in strong relief the factors that have perpetuated the political isolation of Soviet Russia, as well as the political and economic necessities that have constantly tended to force her within the orbit of the commerce and politics of western Europe. In this conflict the author finds the problem and the danger of Russia. The three following chapters are concerned with aspects of the after-war settlement outside of Europe. Professor Keith contributes an important discussion of the British Dominions, sketching their status before the Peace Conference and the rôle their representatives played at Paris, and concluding with a carefully expressed statement of the influence of the war and the League of Nations upon their present sentiments and future status. Professor Hornbeck and Dr. Learned contribute chapters on Shantung at the Peace Conference and on the attitude of the United States Senate towards the Versailles Treaty, respectively, both marked by a judiciousness of tone and a clearness of exposition which have been conspicuously absent from most treatments of these contentious and complex topics. Of the final third of the volume, about a hundred pages are devoted to a chapter on international developments under the League of Nations. This is divided into five sections—the making of the Covenant, the international labor section of the Treaties, the Permanent Court of International Justice, the mandatory system, and guaranties against war. There follows an "epilogue", containing general considerations on the Peace Conference and its aftermath, and an appendix which includes documents, statistics, and indexes.

When the student reviews the entire six volumes, he can only mingle with his congratulations to those responsible for their publication an expression of deep gratitude. It will be possible in the future to write a more orderly history of the Peace Conference and one in which much that is now obscure will be elucidated by new sources of information. But it was important that the truth as seen by those who were close to the Conference should be recorded and made generally known, before the legends that grow up about a great historical event had hardened into

the appearance of solid truth. A fine service has been done not merely to this but to future generations of historical students.

CHARLES SEYMOUR.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

American Economic History. By HAROLD UNDERWOOD FAULKNER, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. [Harper's Historical Series, edited by Guy Stanton Ford.] With an Introduction by the Editor. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1924. Pp. xii, 721. \$3.50.)

"ECONOMIC HISTORY is not only an absolutely interesting subject in itself, but it is the foundation and framework upon which all history must be built. . . . Political and military history tell chiefly how things happened; economic history, why things happened." Such is the underlying thesis of this work, and these delightfully candid and somewhat naïve statements from the preface of the book forewarn and forearm one in regard to the merits and demerits of the publication. Such a thesis is exactly what one would expect in a work coming out of a technical school. Fortunately for its moderating effect upon his thesis, Dr. Faulkner holds a history position, he is evidently well trained in history, and his book bears every evidence of the beneficial results of his familiarity with history as contrasted with the more specialized field of economics.

As indicated by the title, this is more than the economic history of the national period of the United States. One hundred and eighty-seven pages are devoted to the period previous to 1789 and numerous references to the colonial background occur in later chapters. Of the twenty-seven chapters, seven are devoted to the colonial period, nine to the period from 1789 to 1861, and eleven to the period since the Civil War. The chapters are topical. Emphasis is laid upon such major topics as agriculture, industry, westward migration, transportation, finance, business consolidation, labor, and world trade.

For economic facts and ideas Dr. Faulkner has gone to the sources, notably to official government publications; for the political, constitutional, psychological, and generally sociological matters he has relied to a considerable extent upon general works and sundry monographs. The reviewer, however, has been able to note a minimum of error in historicity of fact and event.

The merits indeed of this work are many. They far outweigh its demerits. Its appearance is good. The print and typography are excellent. It is well organized as to contents and equipped with the necessary aids to class-room use. The author writes boldly and on the whole he writes well. The treatment of many subtopics, particularly under the larger topics of finance and business, throws light on matters very dark to the average college student.

With such a high opinion of the merits of a book, it seems a mistake to dwell on its defects. Happily these are, in the main, minor. There is of course too much broad generalization on the fundamental importance of economics. A slight New England bias crops out from time to time (pp. 50, 129, 178, 372). Some of the foot-notes appear to be interjected as corrections, possibly at the suggestion of the editor (pp. 12, 32, 140), and they are inadequate in number, for there are a number of quotations without references (pp. 34, 103, 168). The political narrative is not sufficiently explained in places (pp. 374, 467). The maps are none too good. If the thesis be accepted, possibly to the average reader's mind the most serious defect will be an extraordinary amount of repetition of minor items in larger syntheses. Uncertainty and variations appear in the technique of foot-note citations.

Errors detected in this book are generally connected with indefinite language, such as, "no natural opening to Cathay was ever discovered" (p. 34); the inclusion of the Quebec Act in the general "policy of coercion and retaliation" (p. 151); "As the south increasingly devoted itself to agriculture" (p. 372). The pages of the *Congressional Globe* demonstrate that it is plainly wrong to say (p. 378) that "The south favored rapid sale of western lands in large tracts at cheap prices, while the north insisted on smaller and more restricted sales at higher prices", unless it be that North means New England and not the Northwest.

Teachers of American economic history will welcome this addition to the best of the excellent treatises we now have on the subject.

ALFRED P. JAMES.

Immigration: Select Documents and Case Records. By EDITH AB-BOTT, Dean of the Graduate School of Social Service Administration in the University of Chicago. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1924. Pp. xxii, 809. \$4.50.)

THE importance of this book may be considered from two points of view. Primarily it may be regarded as a contribution to the literature on immigration. Secondly it may be estimated, in accordance with the prefatory note, as the first of a number of source-books which the Graduate School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago proposes to issue.

The book is divided into three parts: "The Journey of the Immigrant"; "Admission, Exclusion, and Expulsion of Immigrants"; "Domestic Immigration Problems." The material consists mainly of transcripts of documents of various kinds—letters, reports, quotations from periodicals, judicial decisions, laws, official papers, and a large number of social case records. It is clearly, then, not a general treatise on immigration. It leaves quite untouched many phases of the problem fully as important as some that are included. The prevailing tendency is to emphasize the legal and individual human aspects. The latter of these can well support the emphasis which this book gives it. Too many of

the writers on immigration have lacked enough actual contact with flesh-and-blood immigrants to enable them either to see or to portray the intimate personal bearings of this great movement. Immigrants have been treated as statistical units, as pawns in the industrial and commercial game of nations, and as the source of votes, but all too seldom as living, breathing personalities. The student will find an abundance of vivid, pulsating illustrative material in this volume. He will also find the book very useful as a reference work for ready consultation of various important documents which are not easily accessible even in the large libraries.

The fact that this book is the precursor of others of the same general type leads to an inquiry as to the exact place and utility of "source-books" of this kind. That they are useful as sources of illustration and means of easy reference has already been suggested. But is there not a danger that the presentation of original documents in such a handy compass may mislead the reader of such a book into the illusion that he is actually studying the subject from the sources, that is, that he is doing first-hand research? What he is likely to forget is that there has been a necessary, sweeping, and rigid selection of the material which is presented to him. This selection is of fully as much import as in the other type of book which presents a summary or digest of original documents, with only brief quotations from or references to them. Thus in the book in question, out of hundreds of letters written during the colonial period describing the conditions of the voyage, only one is included. Again, the federal laws of 1882 and 1917 are quoted, but nothing is given of the numerous laws which were enacted in the meantime. The case records are taken from the files of the Immigrants' Protective League of Chicago and the Immigrants' Commission of Illinois. How is the student to know that the documents thus selected are typical, or that the sources are representative? From his confidence in the author, of course. In this respect he is just as well off, and no better, as if he were reading a book of the other type in which the author presents his conclusions from a mass of material. In either case the reliability of the impression depends on the reliability of the author—in the present instance beyond question, of course. The source-book of this type is invaluable as a compendium of illustration and concrete detail, but it is not a means of first-hand investigation of a subject.

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD.

The Dominion of New England: a Study in British Colonial Policy.

By VIOLA FLORENCE BARNES, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in Mount Holyoke College. (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1923. Pp. ix, 303. \$3.50.)

DR. BARNES states the object of her book as an effort "to show that the most complete expression of the British colonial policy in the seven-

teenth century was the Dominion of New England" (p. vii). In an introduction of three pages she hastily sketches British colonial policy to 1665. In the first chapter we are told how Massachusetts refused to adapt herself to that policy from the date named to 1686. The remainder of the volume is devoted to an exposition of the "experiment in consolidation", first under Dudley and then under Andros. The establishment of the Andros government is described and, in five chapters, the separate topics of Legislation and Taxation, Administration of Justice, Liberty of Conscience, the Land System, and Defense are discussed as related to Andros and the Dominion idea. The final two chapters are taken up with an account of the revolution and the reasons for the abandonment of the consolidation policy.

The author takes a broad view and her attitude toward the very real difficulties and perplexities of the British government faced with the problem of colonial administration is sympathetic and entirely in accord with that now adopted by most historians. "Consolidation", she finds, "in its essential features was an improvement over the former governmental organization of the colonies", and the fact that it did not succeed was due to the failure to provide a representative assembly, to certain blunders by the Lords of Trade in drawing up Andros's instructions, and to the governor himself, who was too strict in carrying them out (p. 44). It is possible that Dr. Barnes has too greatly simplified the causes of failure as well as those of the revolution which overthrew Andros at the end. The explanation of the strength of the revolutionary movement she finds mainly in the "fanaticism of the Puritan theocrats" (p. 251). Her analysis, in various parts of the book, of the attitude of the "moderates" and of their gradual alienation from an experiment which they at first favored is suggestive and well done.

Her estimate of Andros does not differ materially from that of the more recent writers on this period. She brings out clearly that he was not a tyrant and that almost all the acts which were described at the time as tyrannical and arbitrary, even that of taking the Congregational meeting-house for Episcopalian worship, were merely carrying out his instructions from home. The author points out that the lack of harmony in Andros's council was due largely to the opposing interests of its mercantile and agrarian members (p. 74), and that Andros thought he was equalizing taxation between groups when he was making himself unpopular with all of them (p. 85). The fact is brought out that taxes were lower under Andros than in the period either before or after (p. 93).

In the main, the book does not alter the general view now held of the Andros régime, but it is the best account which we yet have of it in all its features. No new source-material has been brought to light. The printed sources named in the bibliographical chapter and on which she has drawn for the most part are all well known, such as the *Calen-*

Mumby: George III. and the American Revolution 375

dar of State Papers, Acts of the Privy Council, Toppan's Randolph, the Andros Tracts, and others. Among manuscript sources she speaks of the "Jefferies Family Papers" but cites from them only once in the text, so far as the reviewer has noted. Eight references to the Gay Transcripts and nineteen to the Colonial Office Papers complete the citations from manuscript except for the Massachusetts Archives, which she has used extensively and to much advantage.

Dr. Barnes has written clearly and well. She has given us all the essential facts, marshalled them with skill, and treated them with critical insight. The volume is a genuine contribution to our knowledge of this important experiment in colonial administration and a work which will have to be consulted by all who deal with this period in the history of New England.

JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS.

George III. and the American Revolution: the Beginnings. [History in Contemporary Letters.] By FRANK ARTHUR MUMBY. (London: Constable and Company. 1924. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin Company. 1923. Pp. xvi, 432. 21 s.)

As a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, Mr. Mumby is credited with the production of sixteen or more volumes of history, which range over the field from *The Youth of Henry VIII.* to *The Great World War* in nine volumes. Apparently this is his first essay into the period of the American Revolution. His approach to the subject seems to rest on the conviction that the Great War has emphasized "the need of re-writing the history of Anglo-American relation" so that partizan American books would cease "their traditional task of inoculating new generations with the obsolete prejudices of the old". At the same time he believes that British prejudices have not survived to so great a degree. He takes the ground "that the American Revolution was not so much a quarrel between two peoples as between two Governments". His own good-will may be reflected in the fact that he dates his preface on "July 4th" and concludes his volume with a eulogy of Washington.

Mr. Mumby disarms severe criticism by confessing frankly that his "work does not profess to furnish the historian with much new material, though certain of the letters are now printed for the first time". Indeed his aim is "simply an attempt to illustrate the character and times of George III. . . . and re-tell the story of the American Revolution through its first phase" by "allowing the leading actors in the drama to state their case as far as possible in their own words". The author proposes eventually "to illustrate the whole course of English history" with such contemporary materials. This volume may be regarded, therefore, as an experiment in adapting this method to a century exceptionally prolific in correspondence.

The volume opens with chapter I. on the Accession of George III. and closes with chapter VIII. on Blows Must Decide, when Washington was appointed the commander-in-chief of the American army of resistance. The stirring history of this period of fifteen years is presented by means of several hundred carefully selected letters written by George III. himself, Lord North, the Dukes of Bedford and Grafton, Grenville, Townshend, Pitt, Fox, Walpole, Burke, Wilkes, Thomas Hutchinson, Samuel Adams, Washington, Franklin, and many other persons of prominence on both sides of the Atlantic. These letters are tied together by the compiler with comments, explanations, and further quotations.

The general result is a volume of more than ordinary interest. The assembling of such a mass of primary material in chronological sequence enables one to get a first-hand understanding of parties, points of view, and statements of principles not to be found in secondary books covering the period. At the same time, one feels that the picture presented does not represent the whole truth. Indeed one suspects that there was a conscious selection of materials to present George III. and the Tories in an unfavorable light and at the same time to let the virtues of the Whigs shine forth as brilliantly as possible. Little or no account is taken of that respectable minority in the colonies that called themselves Loyalists and were known by their foes as Tories. Original sources may be used most effectively and adroitly to plead a cause for the simple reason that they seem to speak with so much authority.

Although one may agree with the author's modest disclaimer that he has presented "much new material" and may question the selection here and there, yet this sort of a handy compendium is worth doing. Later installments will be awaited with interest.

A. C. FLICK.

David Wilmot, Free-Soiler: a Biography of the Great Advocate of the Wilmot Proviso. By CHARLES BUXTON GOING. (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1924. Pp. xvii, 787. \$6.00.)

DAVID WILMOT entered the local political field in 1835 as an ardent Jackson-Van Buren Democrat. Disappointment because the national convention of 1844 nominated Polk instead of Van Buren did not prevent Wilmot from asserting on the stump that "the republican of after times will point to the presidential conflict of 1844 as equal in glory, and as fortunate in its results, as that of 1800, when the democracy so significantly triumphed under the lead of Thomas Jefferson, its greatest apostle and champion".

In that same campaign Wilmot himself was elected to represent his district in Congress, and he therefore made his *début* as a legislator during the first session of the Polk administration.

In general, Wilmot supported the leading measures of the administration, such as the establishment of the Independent Treasury, the tariff act of 1846, and the President's Oregon policy. On certain matters relating to slavery Wilmot aligned himself with the Southern wing of the party more closely than Polk had ever done, although he was destined later to break with the President and the party on the subject of slavery in the territories. For example, he voted to revive the "gag rule" against antislavery petitions; to lay on the table all remonstrances against the annexation of Texas; and against a resolution designed to exclude slavery from Texas. His position, according to his biographer (p. 52), was:

Where slavery existed in Wilmot's time, it was a legalized institution written into the constitution and the laws of the States or the territorial governments—even recognized and protected in the Constitution of the United States. It represented property rights and vested interests which an "able and impartial jurist" could not consent to have swept away by an *ex parte* motion.

When, on August 8, 1846, Wilmot moved his famous amendment to the two-million bill, the "proviso" that slavery should be excluded from territory to be acquired by this money, he not only entered a wedge which was to split the Democratic party, but he inaugurated an "irrepressible conflict" which ended only at Appomattox.

In 1848 Wilmot joined the "Barnburners" in supporting Van Buren for the presidency, and in 1856 he left the Democratic party and helped to organize the Republican party, with which he was affiliated during the remainder of his life.

Mr. Going's book is not a personal biography of David Wilmot, but rather a history of Wilmot's public career and of the times in which that career had its setting. As an account of Wilmot's part in public affairs, the volume is all that could be desired. As a history of the times, it has certain defects which are often found in biographical narratives. If the author, instead of confining his attention so largely to Free-soilers and their views, had given more time to the study of Democratic statesmen and their motives, he would have given us a better balanced and less biassed account of the period. For example, further study of the Democratic convention of 1844 would doubtless have convinced him that Van Buren's nomination was not prevented merely by a "bit of sharp practice" (p. 32) or "notorious strategy" (p. 290) on the part of slavery extensionists.

No bibliography of sources is given in the book, but the text and the foot-notes indicate that the author has made no use of such valuable works as those of Justin H. Smith, or of many biographies and monographs which deal with the period he has covered.

In spite of the defects just noted, the volume is a clearly written and valuable account of the "Proviso" statesman. It also makes available speeches made by Wilmot which are not easily accessible elsewhere.

E. I. McCORMAC.

The Evolution of French Canada. By JEAN CHARLEMAGNE BRACQ.
(New York: Macmillan Company. 1924. Pp. viii, 467.
\$2.50.)

THIS is more than a historical study of the French race in Canada. Nearly half the book is devoted to a survey of French-Canadian agriculture, industry, education, literature, art, and philanthropy at the present day. The historical chapters merely recount an old story and add nothing that is new, but the latter portion of the book is fresh and interesting. It deals with topics on which astonishingly little has been written. Unfortunately the author betrays no familiarity with the primary sources of material and does not appear to have utilized some of the more recent monographic studies in his field. He has cut a wide swath through a great mass of publications, as the foot-notes indicate, but has apparently gone on the principle that all books are created free and equal.

Dr. Bracq is not always fair. Take his discussion of Lord Durham's *Report*, for example. He charges that Durham, while writing his report, "was using his personal influence to prevent its adoption by Parliament" (pp. 97-98). This would be highly important, if true, but no fair-minded historian would accept so serious an accusation on the authority which this volume cites for it. Durham may have been unfair to the French Canadians, but assuredly he was not more so than this volume is to Durham. His famed *Report* is dismissed as a series of "vaticinations" which merely excite the author's pity (p. 105). On the other hand, there is ample praise for Canada's public men of French extraction, one and all of them. Even the redoubtable Honoré Mercier is neatly whitewashed (p. 140).

The book, in short, is written to maintain a thesis, namely, that the French Canadians are a great race, the salt of the earth. Their achievements have been more monumental than the rest of the world has realized, and this despite all manner of injustice at the hands of Englishmen from governors down. There is much harping on this theme, especially on the wrongs which Britons have done to the French in days gone by. All the ancient irritations are meticulously recounted—to what good end it is hard to say. The author is a French Huguenot whose "discovery" of his kinsmen on the shores of the St. Lawrence is a somewhat belated one. But his admiration for their prowess in all fields is unrestrained. "The average wealth of the Quebec farmer is probably greater", he tells us, "than that of the tiller of the soil in the New England states" (pp. 239-240). This is not a very good guess, but it is typical of many others in the book.

The author's style is all his own. Scraps of information from every quarter are crowded upon each other's heels. The proof-reading leaves a good deal to be desired, especially in the spelling of English names. Glenelg appears as "Glenely", Hincks as "Hinks", and Porritt as "Parritt". Yet the book makes fairly good reading—especially to those

who already know something about the subject. There is an eighteen-page bibliography, also compiled on the egalitarian principle, in which Parkman's *Old Régime* is not deigned worthy of inclusion nor Kingsford's ten-volume *History of Canada*.

WILLIAM BENNETT MUNRO.

Lucas Alamán, el Reconocimiento de Nuestra Independencia por España y la Unión de los Países Hispano-Americanos. Con una Introducción por ANTONIO DE LA PEÑA Y REYES. [Archivo Histórico Diplomático Mexicano, núm. 7.] (Mexico: Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores. 1924. Pp. xx, 116.)

THE series of which this volume forms a part promises to constitute the most substantial publication of archive materials relating to Mexican diplomacy that has yet appeared. The editors, who are officials connected with the Foreign Office of the Mexican nation, propose to publish documents drawn both from the repositories of Mexico and from those of foreign countries. Entered upon less than two years ago, the work has proceeded with gratifying rapidity.

Heretofore the official publications of the Mexican government relating to the diplomacy of the nation have been somewhat meagre. During the early national period an occasional report of the Minister of Foreign Relations to Congress, or the documents bearing upon a diplomatic contest of unusual interest, was presented to the public. The Díaz government, in addition to these occasional reports and documents, published regularly after 1896 a bulletin relating mainly to consular affairs and claims.¹ In connection with the celebration of the centenary of Mexican independence Genaro García edited six volumes, but these bore more directly upon the history of Mexico.² At the same time the personnel of the Foreign Office projected a huge work of more than one hundred volumes dealing with the foreign relations of the Mexican nation since 1821, but only three³ had appeared when the task was interrupted by the late revolutions.

The present series has included documents and introductory comments upon a variety of topics. Number 1 gave a very brief historical survey of Mexican diplomacy from 1810 to the close of French intervention. Number 2 contained two critical essays and several documents bearing upon political and commercial relations between New Spain and Japan during the second decade of the seventeenth century. In

¹ *Boletín Oficial de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores*. Twenty-two volumes of the publication had appeared by 1906, when it seems to have been discontinued.

² *Documentos Históricos Mexicanos: Obra Commemorativa del Primer Centenario de la Independencia de Mexico*. Tomos I.-VI. (Mexico, Museo Nacional, 1910.)

³ *La Diplomacia Mexicana*. Tomos I.-III. (Mexico, Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1910-1913.)

number 3 appeared documents relating to a diplomatic clash between Mexico and Great Britain in 1843 over a British flag which the Mexican army had captured in Texas. Number 4 dealt with the mission of the Peruvian agent Manuel Nicolás Corpancho to Mexico during the early years of French intervention. Number 5 presented a resolution of the Colombian Congress which declared that Benito Juárez deserved the title of "Benemérito de América", and other documents relating thereto. Number 6 gave a complete list of the ministers who had served as chiefs of the Mexican Foreign Office from 1821 to 1924.

The small volume now under review bears upon the attempts of the Mexican government to gain the recognition of the mother country (between 1829 and 1832). These attempts were made through the Mexican minister at London and under the encouragement of the British government. Nothing was accomplished, and the documents are of interest mainly as revealing the obstinacy of the Spanish monarch, the cordial relations of Great Britain and Mexico, and a strong sentiment of solidarity between the Spanish American states. In the near future the editors promise a volume treating more extensively this feeling of solidarity.

The numbers published to date give a fair idea of what the series may become. Each volume of documents contains a valuable introduction, but no attempt has been made at annotation. From the introductions the critical historian will perceive that the editors are dominated by three strong motives: a profound nationalism, a lively Hispanic-Americanism, and a deep resentment towards the United States. Scholars thus dominated will perhaps not present a complete and unbiassed account of Mexico's foreign relations. What works of this nature have been perfect in this respect? And yet all such publications will be accorded a fervent welcome by students of American diplomacy, who cannot fail to hope that this enterprise will move forward as speedily as possible.⁴

J. F. RIPPY.

⁴ No. 8, published more recently, is a volume of documents, edited by the same hand as no. 7, relating to the mission of Gorostiza, Mexican minister to the United States 1836-1837, chiefly the correspondence between the Mexican minister and the Department of State of the United States relative to Texan matters, *Don Manuel Eduardo de Gorostiza y la Cuestión de Texas*. No. 9 is *León XII. y los Países Hispano-Americanos*, a group of documents concerning the encyclical of Pope Leo XII., Sept. 24, 1824, which the Mexican government interpreted as intended to induce the bishops to support the domination of the King of Spain. No. 10 (pp. ix, 105) presents a body of notes addressed in 1861 and 1862 by Antonio de la Fuente, minister of the Mexican republic at the court of Napoleon III., to Thouvenel, the French minister of foreign affairs. No. 11 is the first part of *La Anexión de Centro América à México* (pp. lxxvii, 169), a collection of documents of 1821, to which its editor, Rafael H. Valle, has prefixed a full bibliographical account of the history of Central America. Ed.

MINOR NOTICES

Principles of a Note-System for Historical Studies. By Earle W. Dow, Professor of European History in the University of Michigan. (New York and London, Century Company, 1924, pp. vi, 124, 55 cuts, \$1.50.) Many of the younger historical students, and not a few of the older historians, are victims of a little-appreciated pitfall in the writing of history. That pitfall is the difficulties connected with note-making and note-using. This book discusses such problems as the following. In what form should notes be taken? How shall one record various kinds of bibliographical and subject-notes? What is involved in taking notes by quotation, paraphrase, or abstract, when one wishes to present the thought or language of another?

Professor Dow divides his book into six chapters, on: the loose-leaf system and size of the card or leaf; kinds of notes; bibliographical notes—source, type, text, author, value, form, subject, descriptive and marginal; subject-notes, those representing the record of another, and those of the author—one's own interpretation or comment on another's writing; methods of classifying and filing; and finally the method of using notes towards a given work. Seventy-seven examples of different forms of notes and methods of filing are given. Generally speaking, the material is well organized. Perhaps the best and most useful chapters are the third and fourth, especially the latter, for it shows clearly why the process of transferring the thoughts or words of another into one's own words often leads to errors—misstatement of facts or a wrong interpretation. The chapter on classification and filing is so detailed that many students would not care to carry out the suggestions in full because of their complexity.

Professor Dow does not discuss one important aspect of note-using, that is, notes which are a part of a completed narrative, *e.g.*, the final bibliography, citations or foot-notes, explanatory and critical notes, their form and their relation to the main text, and other notes used by modern scientific historical students for the purpose of enabling the reader to verify their work. Such notes are a part of the technique of note-using, and a surprisingly large number of even the older historical students give evidence of the need of more knowledge of this art.

The illustrative examples are very suggestive and should prove useful. The book is an excellent piece of work and should certainly be consulted by all serious students of history and by other persons who take notes for historical purposes.

M. W. JERNEGAN.

The Genius of Israel: a Reading of Hebrew Scriptures prior to the Exile. By Carleton Noyes. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924, pp. xi, 452, \$5.00.) Mr. Noyes has done an excel-

lent piece of work. He has oriented the Hebrew people correctly with reference to the great peoples who constantly imperilled their existence. He has shown clearly the relative weakness and political insignificance of the Hebrews as compared with the great world-empires of their time. He has likewise brought to the fore the degree of their indebtedness to the civilization which they inherited from their predecessors and in the midst of which they worked out their historical course. Particularly good is the discussion of conditions in the Oriental world at large and in Palestine especially, prior to the coming of Israel into Canaan. The clarity of the author's thought is matched by the felicity of the language in which it is clothed. Not all histories are readable; this one is eminently so.

The period covered by this volume stops with the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C. In that period there are many problems facing the historian. No writer may expect to satisfy every critic on all points—perhaps, indeed, not even on any point! There is so much opportunity for legitimate difference of opinion. Mr. Noyes adopts the hypothesis that only part of the Hebrews went down into Egypt; but he identifies the “Genius of Israel” wholly with that part and leaves the element that remained in Canaan wholly out of account. Perhaps that is the part of wisdom; but the historian wishes to know something of the part played by those who stayed behind and of the problem of amalgamation after the return of the clans from Egypt. At least, if the problem cannot be solved, the reader should be told that there is a problem there.

Yet again, the treatment of Isaiah is open to question. He is here presented as having supported Hezekiah in the crisis of Sennacherib's invasion and as having threatened the Assyrians with overthrow. Not only so but the Messianic prophecies in Isaiah are accepted as genuine, at least in part. This, of course, is still the view of probably the majority of Old Testament scholars. But those who have watched the progress of the discussion on this subject in recent years, especially in the work of Kemper Fullerton, will hardly expect to see this view remain unchanged.¹ The excision of these Messianic prophecies from the work of Isaiah changes the story of Israel's “genius” greatly; but the faith and courage of the great prophetic leaders are not thereby minimized; if anything they are magnified.

Notwithstanding questions like these and notwithstanding the fact that the author disclaims any purpose to write “history” and has left out of his discussion much that belongs in a history, yet the present volume is an admirable sketch of the progress of Hebrew life and whets our appetite for a second volume which shall complete the story.

J. M. POWIS SMITH.

¹ See J. M. Powis Smith, “Isaiah and the Future”, in *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, XL. 252–258.

Etruria and Rome. By R. A. L. Fell, M.A. [Thirlwall Prize Essay, 1923.] (Cambridge, University Press, 1924, pp. vii, 182, 8 s. 6 d.) The fascination of Etruria is as perennial as it is elusive. Mr. Fell admits that "any study of the Etruscans must inevitably cover some ground on which much work has already been done". The reviewer fails to find much outside that category. Nevertheless this Thirlwall Prize Essay is well done. It has four parts. In part I. ("The Origin and Growth of the Etruscan Power") are stated the theories of Etruscologists on the provenience of this puzzling people. Mr. Fell sides with those who hold the Etruscans to be an Asiatic people and to have come to Italy by sea, about 850 B. C. The author is at his best in part II. ("The Etruscans in Latium"). He traces Etruscan influences in Roman architecture with the help of many an Ariadnean thread, and comes very well out of the maze. He handles the social life and political expansion of Rome under the Etruscans with a less sure hand; he purposely—and sensibly—passes by the dark corridors that might have led him into the limbo of Etruscan philology; but he neglects his opportunity in touching so lightly Etruscan art, the most tangible thing about them. He mentions in his notes Poulsen's *Etruscan Tomb Paintings* and Mrs. Van Buren's *Figurative Terracotta Revetments*—though one is not sure he knows who she is, for he quotes her by three different names in almost successive notes (p. 66, n. 4; p. 68, n. 2; p. 69, n. 3)—but he gets almost nothing from their fine works. It is in "The Roman Conquest of Etruria and Umbria" that the author falls into the same quagmire with his predecessors. He gives the *whole* story—which he recognizes is not history—from Roman sources, and documents it in his notes with great care, but when all is said and done, one has arrived—nowhere. Nevertheless, the book is a valuable little résumé.

RALPH VAN DEMAN MAGOFFIN.

De Wikingen in de Lage Landen bij de Zee. Door Jan de Vries. (Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink en Zoon, 1923, pp. xii, 430, 9.50 gulden.) Since van Bolhuis wrote his *Noormannen in Nederland* in 1834–1835 no other scholar has ventured to investigate this difficult theme. Professor de Vries has carefully used all possible data in Norse sagas, Irish, Anglo-Saxon, and Frankish chronicles. He has taken careful account of Scandinavian scholarship on the Viking period. Because of their central location the lands at the Rhine, Meuse, and Scheldt mouths were bound to be important centres for the activities of the Northmen. Dorestad had a flourishing commerce with Scandinavian lands, especially as a market for Frankish swords from Cologne and Solingen. Dynastic difficulties in Denmark, of which a full knowledge is impossible, are in large measure responsible for the incursions. Hence the fragmentary nature of the data and a treatment which tends to become monotonous. But the author rises well above the limitations of his materials and a coherent picture of Harald and his sons, Rodulf, Rorik, Godfrid, and

Harald, results. The fiefs in the Low Countries serve as points from which to attack Denmark and extort money or other advantages from the weak Karlings. Quentowic and London are, it appears, plundered because these are commercial rivals of Dorestad and Utrecht. While no lasting settlement was made as in Normandy, nevertheless the Viking influence is thought to be considerable. The *huslotha*, a tax long common in Friesland, is said to date from this time. Then there is a positive commercial stimulus and a possible political influence in shaping the County of Holland. The author is never dogmatic. But difference in judgment there will be, as, for example, in regard to the statement on page 14 where Boniface is supposed to have exercised an important influence in the erection of dikes because of his Northumberland origin. Perhaps, but it is certain that dikes still existed from Roman days—the one on the left bank of the Rhine is a case in point—and the example of Northumbria need not have been important. For all studies of the Viking expansion the work will prove invaluable.

HENRY S. LUCAS.

Richard the Lion Heart. By Kate Norgate. (London, Macmillan and Company; New York, Macmillan Company, 1924, pp. viii, 349, 16 s.) This, as Miss Norgate says in her preface, is a biography, not a history of Richard's reign, and, one may add, essentially a romantic biography. There is no constitutional or social history, indeed England and Normandy are never in the foreground. Richard's Aquitanian youth is recounted at length, and there is a chapter on his last years in France, but two-thirds of the volume are given to Richard's crusade, regarded, we are told, by Richard himself as "the most important work of his life". There is no general characterization of the subject of the biography, though the attitude throughout is favorable. The volume is a detailed narrative from the chroniclers, by preference the English ones, and the theme carries a perpetual interest for many readers, heightened perhaps for those who watched anxiously the progress of General Allenby toward the city which Richard never reached, and heard Vesnitch recall the ancient relations between England and the Jugo-Slavs created by Richard's sojourn at Ragusa (p. 267). Many of us would have preferred a real history of the reign, but that is not Miss Norgate's type of history. What may more justly be criticized is the almost complete neglect of the fiscal and documentary records, the latter valuable even for a mere itinerary, as Cartellieri has shown in his provisional check-list of Richard's charters; and the still stranger neglect of recent writers. The only recent studies utilized by name are Richard's *Comtes de Poitou*, Kneller's study of Richard's captivity (1893), and Powicke's *Loss of Normandy* (cited but once). We miss any reference to other outstanding monographs dealing with important phases of the subject, such as the biographical notes in Delisle's *Actes de Henri II.* (e.g., on Stephen the seneschal, Norgate, p. 93), Chalandon's *Royaume de Sicile*, Cartellieri's *Philipp August*, and Röhrich's *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem*.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

Illustrations to the Life of St. Alban in Trin. Coll. Dublin MS. E. i. 40. Reproduced in Collotype Facsimile by the care of W. R. L. Lowe and E. F. Jacob, with a Description of the Illustrations by M. R. James. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. 39, 57 plates, 42 s.) Among the books of Archbishop Ussher, bought by the officers and soldiers of Cromwell's army in Ireland and later presented by Charles II. to Trinity College, Dublin, is a thirteenth-century manuscript, once the property of St. Albans Abbey. Its contents relate entirely to St. Alban and his abbey and to St. Amphibalus. The folios of the manuscript reproduced in facsimile in this volume are, in addition to the second fly-leaf, the fifty-four that contain illustrations; there are also two plates of a Modena manuscript of John Dunstable's hymn to St. Alban. The pictures were painted on finer vellum and pasted into spaces left blank for them, and they fall into three groups: thirty are devoted to the legend of SS. Alban and Amphibalus, eight to the mission of SS. Germanus and Lupus to Britain against the Pelagians, and the remainder to the invention and translation of St. Alban's relics and the foundation of the abbey by Offa. For these incidents they form the fullest portrayal extant in medieval art.

The introduction justly calls attention to the wide claim which the book has as a permanent record of a very notable example of English thirteenth-century drawing and calligraphy. Such a collection of illustrations should prove most useful to students of medieval art; the reproductions furnish, of course, no clue to the colors employed, but the drawing is excellent; and the text is serviceable for the study of St. Albans script. After a brief account of the manuscript Dr. James gives a detailed description of each illustration. He has made a slight mistake, I think, in his description of the picture on f. 51a: it is St. Lupus and not the old man in the background who has his hand on St. Germanus's shoulder.

The chief interest of the work arises from its authorship. To Matthew Paris may be attributed its French verse; and, in Dr. James's judgment, the script too is his handiwork and he designed, if he did not actually draw, the illustrations.

ALFRED H. SWEET.

The Emperor Charles IV., 1316-1378: a Study in Holy Roman Imperialism. By Gerald Groveland Walsh, S.J. [Marquis of Lothian Essay, 1923.] (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1924, pp. viii, 87, 3 s. 6d.) To make as much of a hero as possible out of one of the least heroic of medieval rulers is the obvious purpose of this essay. Its author is a young member of Campion Hall at Oxford and of the Jesuit order. His approach to his subject is what would have been called in the fourteenth century distinctly "Guelph". He is deeply impressed with the medieval ideal of a unified world-order under the special divinely ordained dual control of

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXX.—25.

a secular and a religious head—the secular to be, of course, at any critical time subordinated to the religious.

Starting with this premise he has read his material with a consistent purpose to find in it support for his judgment of Charles IV. as the most complete embodiment of both sides of the imperial-papal tradition. He has no difficulty in accepting the courtly accounts of the prince's precocious talent and his almost saintly conduct of life. He makes free use of his imagination in picturing the influences which "must have" affected his spiritual and intellectual development. It is easy for him to account for Charles's persistent opposition to Ludwig the Bavarian by a desire to rid the world of a "heretic" emperor, and he sees nothing ludicrous in the spectacle of his saintly hero in Italy bargaining with town after town and trying to play at one time the rôles of an efficient political administrator and a loyal upholder of papal prerogative.

His account of the "Golden Bull" would give the impression that Charles, having pacified Italy, had only to draw up a comprehensive scheme of government for Germany to secure to that country also the blessings of permanent peace. According to our author every clause of that famous document, which has been aptly characterized as the Emperor's "decree of abdication", was the result of his own free initiative. The omission of all reference to papal "approbation" of the imperial election had no significance because that approbation was assumed by every one and was implicit in every statement.

In Germany itself "peace", which was being promoted by voluntary leagues of princes and towns, is represented as being the result—in so far as there was any result—of the energy and authority of the Emperor. Our author will have time, if he lives, to read history with a view to learning what happened rather than to proving an *a priori* thesis.

E. EMERTON.

El Piloto Mayor de la Casa de la Contratación de Sevilla: Pilotos Mayores del Siglo XVI (Datos Biográficos). Por José Pulido Rubio, Catedrático de Geografía e Historia en el Instituto General y Técnico de Huelva. [Publicaciones del Centro Oficial de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla, Biblioteca Colonial Americana, tomo X.] (Seville, Tip. Zarzuela, 1923, pp. viii, 299.) In this monograph Professor Rubio has attempted to give a somewhat general summary of the special functions exercised by the pilot major of the Casa in Spain's administration of her colonial interests in the New World.

Veitia Linage, in his *Norte de la Casa de la Contratación*, gives him the guiding line of his special study, and, if to the general information contained in that excellent work he has not made extensive contribution, he has shown himself to be the possessor of a commendable ability for setting down in interesting fashion the facts of greatest importance.

He has noted that in the earliest years of transatlantic discovery there were three pilots major; the chief pilot of the royal fleet, having the

assigned duties of guarding the route to the Indies, the chief pilot of the fleet of New Spain, and a chief pilot of the Casa de la Contratación who came to hold a place of very special importance. The several duties of this third chief pilot are set forth in adequate detail by the author, it being noted that he was required to examine those who sought service as pilots in the Spanish fleet under fixed rules governing such examinations, that he was directed to supervise the construction of instruments of navigation, and that especially he was to give care to the drafting of charts and maps for use in the official service, which involved the construction and his continued supervision of a *padrón real*, or pattern map into which should be entered all important geographical details furnished by captains, pilots, and cosmographers who accompanied transoceanic expeditions.

It is noted that in the choice of a pilot major those at first were selected for the office who especially had distinguished themselves in expeditional service, and those at first chosen were foreign-born, as Vespucci, Solís, and Cabot, while later special emphasis was placed upon a scientific knowledge of seamanship. If, however, added to this knowledge, there was possession of an actual practical experience, the chances for a candidate's selection to the office were strengthened.

The author directs attention to the increasing duties of the pilot major as the years pass, and to the expansion of the geographical activities of the Casa, this leading in the year 1552 to the creation of the chair of cosmography and to the appointment of a special incumbent with specifically assigned duties.

A section of the monograph is given over to brief biographies of the chief pilots of the sixteenth century with attention to their respective services, and about one-half of it to documentary material relating to the *padrón real* and to the part taken by the several important cosmographers in its construction, concluding with documents having to do with the appointment, the duties, and the salaries of the several chief pilots.

E. L. STEVENSON.

Taxation in Salford Hundred, 1524-1802. Edited with Introduction and Notes by James Tait, Litt.D., F.B.A. [Chetham Society, new series, vol. LXXXIII.] (Manchester, the Society, 1924, pp. xl, 188.) This volume contains the detailed returns of various taxes for Salford Hundred, Lancashire. The most interesting are those of the Tudor subsidies levied in 1524, 1543, 1563, and 1600. The returns of the hearth tax of 1666 and of the land tax between 1780 and 1802 are not printed in full. An appendix notes the charges against the townships when fifteenths were levied in the fourteenth and later centuries. By selecting the returns for one hundred the editor has made it possible to compare the methods of assessment of and the burden imposed upon the people by different taxes over a long period of time. The plan will commend itself to all students of the history of English taxation. It is

refreshing also to find an introduction to a series of taxation documents that concerns itself with their historical background rather than with matters of purely local interest. Dr. Tait's introduction sketches the history of taxes upon income from land and upon personal property to the nineteenth century. It is especially valuable for the Tudor period where it throws new light upon the attempts made at equitable as well as remunerative taxation. The transcription and editing of the documents leave nothing to be desired.

JAMES F. WILLARD.

La Vie, la Mode, et le Costume au XVII^e Siècle—Époque Louis XIII.: Étude sur la Cour de Lorraine, établie d'après les Mémoires des Fournisseurs et Artisans. Par Hippolyte Roy, Lauréat de l'Institut; Préface de Christian Pfister, Membre de l'Institut. (Paris, Édouard Champion, 1924, pp. xvi, 553, 50 fr.) A work on the life, fashions, and customs in Lorraine from 1624 to 1633, especially a work based chiefly on receipted bills, might at first glance suggest the dry and the pedantic and appear to be confined within limits so narrow as to have a lure only for a select few. A further examination reveals instead a work that is not only "Darwinian in theory but Hellenic in form"—a piece of real artistry. It is a study of some 10,000 registers of the accounts of the Duke of Lorraine. But it is no "queen's washing list" nor that mere enumeration of facts than which, in the language of the French proverb, there is nothing more *bête*. The fact here is connected and therefore significant. The writer while he worked in seclusion among the old ducal archives looked out metaphorically, if not literally, upon a wide horizon, for the court of Lorraine at this epoch was a copy of the court of France under the domination of Richelieu. A direct study of the latter, however, is impossible on account of the fact that its records were destroyed in the great fire of 1737. This study therefore throws light not only on the court life of Lorraine but also on the court of France at an important epoch in its history. The reader is also led outside of the court and learns what commercial relations Lorraine had with the rest of the world, how trade was carried on, how and where fairs were held, what were the methods of advertising in those days, in short, how the ordinary man as well as the courtier lived and had his being. Further, a study of the terms used in the bills explains many an allusion in literature. A line from a play of Molière, a passage from Montaigne, a stanza from Clément Marot or François Villon otherwise obscure, now becomes understandable. Moreover the author has not only verified the past, he has made it vivid. One gains a sense of reality of the lords and ladies, as they file before us, of the artisans and tradesmen, the author's "obscure and unconscious collaborators".

The value of the book is increased by a glossary of terms and by several specimens of the type of documents on which it is based, such as the notes of a tailor, of a linen merchant, and of a perfumer.

ELOISE ELLERY.

English Society in the Eighteenth Century as Influenced from Oversea. By Jay Barrett Botsford, Ph.D., Instructor in History in Brown University. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1924, pp. ix, 388, \$2.50.) For a first venture this is, on the whole, a creditable piece of work. Projected as a doctoral dissertation it aims to do for the eighteenth century what Professor Gillespie, in a Columbia thesis published some four years ago, undertook to do for the period previous to 1700. Dr. Botsford has read widely in contemporary literature and newspapers, he pictures existing conditions in a bright, lively fashion with well-selected illustrative quotations, and most of his conclusions are reasonable and sound. On the other hand, while no one has specifically treated English society in the eighteenth century from the standpoint of overseas influence and while the author has diligently studied many first-hand materials, his picture of the various aspects of social life will not be as novel, at least to the student or even the well-informed reader, as the title would indicate. Among other things there is not a little on trade and commerce which was professedly to be excluded from the treatment. Then, in places, groups of descriptive matter are heaped together without contributing appreciably to the end in view. Also, notwithstanding a generally logical sequence in the chapters, there are traces of repetition which tend to become wearisome, and at times the reader is hurried from one end of the century to the other with bewildering rapidity. Furthermore, the attractiveness of the style is marred by the too frequent use of hackneyed phrases, many of them of French ancestry. A few statements are either actually erroneous or seem to be so from the loose or ambiguous way in which they are presented. One would naturally think of Alexander Selkirk or even *Sjouke Gabbes* as a more likely source for *Robinson Crusoe* than Dampier. Actual typographical errors are few, among them apparently the Duke of "Chambos" for Chandos. Dr. Botsford informs us that he has got little help from the general histories; but more attention to them would have enabled him to treat the Pitts and Charles James Fox with a surer touch. He modestly states that his ample bibliography does not pretend to be complete; but one is surprised to note among the omissions Williams, *History of English Journalism*, Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*, Mantoux, *La Révolution Industrielle*, Besant, *London in the Eighteenth Century*, and to find Bancroft included instead of Channing.

A. L. C.

Lady Suffolk and her Circle. By Lewis Melville [i.e., Lewis S. Benjamin]. (London, Hutchinson and Company; Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924, pp. xix, 292, 21 s.) Another work has been added to the long list on English court life under the Hanoverians. Henrietta Hobart (1688?-1767) married Charles Howard, later earl of Suffolk, just before they started for Hanover, where they hoped to ingratiate themselves with the ruling family. They did receive

some vague promises from the Electress Sophia and her son, George Lewis, but returned after five years to London, even poorer, if possible, than when they set out. When George Lewis became George I. of England, several months later, Howard found himself one of the grooms of his bedchamber, and Mrs. Howard was selected as one of the women of the bedchamber of Caroline of Anspach, princess of Wales. It was somewhat later, apparently, that Mrs. Howard became the mistress of the Prince of Wales, later George II.

The book under review discusses the career of this attractive woman at the English court. The author concludes that she exercised little political influence of any kind over the king, as the power behind the throne was Queen Caroline. This fact, however, was clearly indicated in Hervey's *Memoirs*, published in 1848. The writer goes too far perhaps in asserting that even George II. realized that he was as wax in the hands of his wife. At least he cites no satisfactory evidence to support his contention. This is true, however, in other instances where he dissents strongly from the accepted point of view (pp. 39, 76).

The short sketches of the leading courtiers are interesting, but they contain comparatively little information that was not already available in Hervey's *Memoirs*, the *Suffolk Correspondence*, Jesse's *Court of England*, and Melville's own works on the same period. The reader might be interested in comparing his accounts of Lady Hervey and Peterborough with those in Jesse, as well as pages 183-193 of the present work with Melville's *Life and Letters of John Gay* (pp. 92-113).

The author almost succeeds in making the personality of Lady Suffolk attractive. She was a close friend of such interesting persons as Gay, Pope, Chesterfield, and Peterborough. He has published several new letters to and from Lady Suffolk from five volumes of the Additional MSS. (British Museum). These shed new light on the unsavory episode of her retirement from the English court, and on her later years as the wife of the Honorable George Berkeley. Unfortunately, there is a lack of proper emphasis throughout the book. The foot-notes are often superfluous, such as those briefly identifying Harley, Bolingbroke, Prior, and Swift (pp. 26, 85-86), and no small number of the others seem to be taken largely from the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

Lewis Melville, it should be noted, is the pen name of Lewis S. Benjamin.

WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN.

Le Rôle Politique de Marie-Antoinette. Par Jeanne Arnauld-Boute-loup, Docteur ès Lettres. (Paris, Édouard Champion, 1924, pp. 377, 25 fr.) On October 14, 1793, the public prosecutor before the revolutionary tribunal charged Marie Antoinette with conspiring with foreign powers against France and with taking part in a conspiracy to bring about civil war within France. The evidence presented at the trial is

not such as to convince the impartial student of the queen's guilt. Mlle. Arnauld-Bouteloup reviews the whole case in the light of the diplomatic correspondence exchanged at the time between Vienna and Versailles, of the contemporary *mémoires*, and of the letters of Marie Antoinette herself. Her conclusion is that "the suspicions of contemporaries are confirmed, in great part, by the facts". The "rôle politique de Marie-Antoinette" has been a favorite theme with historians; the late Jules Flammermont left behind him an incomplete manuscript dealing with it. Mlle. Arnauld-Bouteloup's treatment of the subject begins with the appearance of the dauphine in France and ends with her imprisonment in August, 1792. The evidence indicates that before she became queen, Marie Antoinette showed little interest in foreign affairs and that her acts were not always favorable to Austrian interests. When she became queen, she did attempt to advance the interests of Austria, but had little influence with the king and his ministers. The period of her real influence, both in domestic and in foreign affairs, was from 1787 to 1792.

The subject is an important one and Mlle. Arnauld-Bouteloup has given us the best volume that has thus far been written upon it; I would not say, however, that it is the best volume that could be written. Although her bibliography includes manuscript as well as printed sources, besides all the important French works on Marie Antoinette, it is not complete. There is no indication that she has read such important works on her subject as those of Glagau, Clapham, and Becker; in her sources, no mention is made of Vivenot's *Quellen zur Geschichte der Deutschen Kaiserpolitik Oesterreichs*, an indispensable source for the period 1789-1792. She might have used with profit the correspondence of the Swedish, English, Venetian, and Pavian ambassadors. As a result of her failure to use this material, certain parts of her work, from 1789 on, are not as good as they might have been. It was a good deal of a *tour de force* to treat so large a subject in less than four hundred pages and to treat it as well as she has done; but the work would have been better had she saved some of the space devoted to general diplomatic history, in which we find nothing new, and given us a more detailed treatment of the rôle of Marie Antoinette in the period 1789 to 1792.

FRED MORROW FLING.

The Political Career of Lord Byron. By Dora Neill Raymond, Ph.D. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1924, pp. xi, 363, \$3.00.) Miss Raymond, who is an instructor in history in Smith College, has in her latest book given us a thorough and enlightened study in a definitely restricted field—Byron's connection with the politics of his period. Limiting herself rather strictly to his political career, she has touched only incidentally upon his amatory adventures, his travels, and his poetry. This volume, nevertheless, presents perhaps as accurate and as clearly drawn a picture of Byron's complex personality as can be found in any of the longer biographies.

It was inevitable that Miss Raymond should trace Byron's liberal tendencies from the date when, in 1806, he defended Charles James Fox against his Tory traducers, until his dramatic death at Missolonghi in 1824, while he was trying to free Greece from her oppressors. She brings out forcefully various phases of his liberalism—his tolerance for English Catholics, his hatred of unjust war, so strangely blended with a secret desire for military distinction, his sympathy for famine-stricken Ireland, his fervent plea in his maiden speech in the House of Lords for justice to the "frame-breakers" of Nottingham, his resentment of Austrian tyranny in Italy, and his final active espousal of the cause of the downtrodden Greeks against the Turks. Byron at one time daily received Italian conspirators at the Palazzo Guiccioli in Ravenna. He abhorred the Congress of Verona and the Holy Alliance; his heroes were Franklin, Washington, Kosciuszko, Bolívar, and Napoleon—for the last of whom he had a "most unorthodox admiration". It was Byron who, in *Don Juan*, spoke frankly of his own

—plain, sworn, downright detestation
Of every despotism in every nation.

Miss Raymond has handled her source-material with intelligence and discrimination. Some readers may regret that she does not deal more fully with *Don Juan* as possibly the most comprehensive expression of Byron's moral and political philosophy; but considerations of space and proportion doubtless compelled her to make a decision on this point. She deserves especial commendation for her successful attempt to make her treatise interesting as well as informing. Her style, which is reminiscent of Mr. Lytton Strachey, is always adequate and sometimes brilliant. Her characterizations are both fair and vivid. The chapter-endings are conspicuously crisp and effective. Those who are still bold enough to like Byron will find in this book a sympathetic treatment of a great political leader, who was capable of such prophetic utterances as the famous passage in his diary: "The king-times are fast finishing. There will be blood shed like water and tears like mist; but the people will conquer in the end." We are grateful to Miss Raymond for having called again to our attention the noble element in Byron's soul.

CLAUDE M. FUESS.

English Church Reform, 1815-1840. By William Law Mathieson, Hon. LL.D. (London and New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1923, pp. x, 180, 10 s. 6 d.) This is a judicious, dispassionate sketch of a subject hitherto untouched. The habit of dissociating State and Church for purposes of post-Reformation history leaves some of our political epochs in an ecclesiastical vacuum—the early Reform era of nineteenth-century England being an instance in point. Dr. Mathieson brings the Church back into the politics of this period, as an institution regarded with more than religious aversion by Radicals and Dissenters, and which,

in deference to the temper of the times, found itself obliged to submit its temporalities to a tightening of secular control. Dr. Mathieson does not undervalue the case for Radicals and Dissenters against the Establishment, but he does take the details of this large portion of the subject for granted, and so leaves his sketch one-sided. However, all that Hansard, the *British Critic*, the *British Magazine*, the *Christian Observer*, the episcopal charges of the time, and the better known episcopal biographies can supply, he has used; the burden of his narrative pertains mainly to the party of defense and of counter-attack within the clerical camp. We miss references to protagonists such as Macaulay and Gladstone, and to the *Parliamentary Papers*, which furnish a wealth of statistics; even a notorious Radical fighter like Joseph Hume becomes, in a double sense, a mere lay-figure, barely noticed. But within the limited field of Anglican church revenues and patronage, the curtailment of "national" privileges, and the composition of cathedral chapters, Dr. Mathieson's work is complete. Those interested in Newman's early career will treasure one of Newman's expressions, printed here incidentally, and levelled at the Revolution of 1688, namely, that the revolution was "a foul and horrible sin". To anyone studying the ecclesiastical origins of the Conservative reaction after 1832—the "war-dance on liberalism" as Dr. Mathieson, with a touch of pleasantry, remarks—this work affords several suggestions. In that respect alone it is a distinct contribution to our knowledge of the era of Reform.

C. E. FRYER.

Die Diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes, 1871-1914: ein Wegweiser durch das grosse Aktenwerk der Deutschen Regierung. Von Bernhard Schwertfeger. Zweiter Teil. *Der Neue Kurs, 1890-1899 (Band VII.-XII.)* (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1924, pp. xv, 386.) The second volume of Schwertfeger's *Pathfinder* is a convenient guide to the German diplomatic despatches of the Caprivi and Hohenlohe period. It summarizes the documents very briefly and shows the connection between them. It is in fact an elaborate table of contents to the large volumes of *Die Grosse Politik* which have already been noted in the *Review* (XXX. 136). One of the most helpful features is the chronological table, which allows the reader to see at a glance what despatches were sent or received on any given day. This is especially convenient, as the documents in *Die Grosse Politik* are not always given in chronological order, but are grouped in chapters according to subject-matter, a single document being sometimes divided and printed in different chapters and even in different volumes. Another table, or index, shows the date, sender, and recipient of each document. As its name indicates, however, this volume is only a pathfinder; scholars will not find it in any sense a substitute for the documents themselves.

S. B. F.

The Pan-German League, 1890-1914. By Mildred S. Wertheimer, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. CXII., no. 2.] (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1924, pp. 256, \$2.75.) Pan-Germanism has long been a term to conjure with, and the Pan-German League (*Alldeutscher Verband*) is popularly regarded as its instrument. Miss Wertheimer has accordingly performed a useful service by her investigation, based principally on the publications of the League, of what it was and did. Founded as a protest against the African agreement of July 1, 1890, and reorganized in 1894, it was perhaps the most violent promoter of Anglophobia in Germany and was watched with some concern in England. But a society which at its apogee could boast of only 21,924 members drawn chiefly from academic and professional circles, an annual budget of about \$20,000, and never more than 8300 subscribers to the *Alldeutsche Blätter*, was, in spite of the noise it made, hardly representative of the German people. Its proceedings got scant attention from the press; its propagandist literature, upon which special funds amounting to \$400,000 were spent, is to-day hard to find in German libraries; and the fifty-nine members who sat in the Reichstag between 1894 and 1914 were, with the exception of the president, Dr. Ernest Hasse, party-men first and Leaguers second. To the government, which it criticized continuously and relentlessly, it was a nuisance that had to be reprimanded now and then from the tribune; upon official policy it had no influence, although Bethmann-Hollweg has admitted that "by 1909 the fact could not be mistaken that the Pan-German movement had begun to make some headway in the Conservative and National Liberal parties" (p. 199). In short, the League was little more than a tool in the hands of Hasse and his successor Class for the spread of extreme chauvinistic ideas, the most notorious of which was the advocacy of a *Nationalstaat* to contain the 90,000,000 Germans in the world; and apart from relief sent to the Boers and to German soldiers in Southwest Africa, its chief accomplishment seems to have been to popularize the word "Pan-German" (*allddeutsch*).

Careful students of German affairs have always discounted the Pan-German League; but Miss Wertheimer is quite justified in pointing out that "Pan-German" meant one thing in Germany, and came to mean quite another abroad, where, thanks largely to André Chéradame and R. G. Usher, it was used—and will doubtless continue to be used—to describe German chauvinism. In the bibliography there are seventy-eight titles of Pan-German publications and an incomplete list of 308 "other German chauvinist publications". The conclusion is that "the influence of the League on German chauvinism as a whole was distinctly bad and tended to introduce an aggressively egotistical note that has acquired for German chauvinism such an unpleasant reputation" (p. 218). The style of the book is often rather journalistic, and the expression "a good time seems to have been had by all" (p. 116), used without quotation-marks, is out of place in historical writing.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

History of Australian Land Settlement, 1788-1920. By Stephen H. Roberts, M.A., Lecturer in British History in the University of Melbourne. With an Introduction by Professor Ernest Scott. (Melbourne, Macmillan and Company, 1924, pp. xx, 427, 21 s.) A difficult subject handled most wonderfully well! Technical it is and technical it is likely to remain; but so judiciously has the author selected his statistics, his legal enactments, and his political events, and with such exactitude has he arranged and balanced the whole that the resulting narrative, far from being prosaic, matter-of-fact, and reading more like a succession of real-estate transactions than a history of British expansion in the southern hemisphere, is highly interesting and even entertaining.

The course of overseas development in every part of Australia yet penetrated, including Tasmania, is traced with thoroughness from the first penal establishment in New South Wales to the soldier settlements of to-day and, although Mr. Roberts has not always distinguished quite carefully enough between mere land appropriation and *bona fide* colonization, he has succeeded in justifying Professor Scott's contention that land settlement "is the fundamental fact in Australian history".

The state socialism of the early years, the controversy or, better, the struggle, between the emancipist and the free settler, the "speculative squires", the pastoral industry, land companies, and other topics, far too many for enumeration here, all have their due share of attention. Squatter life may have, proportionately, more than its share; but that is legitimate, since the thing itself is so characteristically Australasian. The origin of the term "squatter" bothers the author somewhat. Did American usage antedate Australian or *vice versa*? Of the obviously earlier English use Mr. Roberts is unaware. No matter what the final connotation, the term originally implied, *everywhere*, the absence of a specific legal title—on the outskirts of the English parish, on the prairies of the American Middle West, and in the Australian bush.

Possible solutions of the labor problem, beginning with the assignment system and assisted emigration, are set forth regularly and in order, one interesting solution only being omitted, no doubt because it was never actually attempted. It was suggested, however, and it involved the transportation to the South Pacific of free blacks from the United States.

The illustrative material of the book, the maps and the graphs, is excellent. There are in all ninety-three figures given. And the documentation is excellent. The foot-notes strengthen and elucidate the text, where necessary. They, together with the appendixes and the bibliography, extensive and exhaustive, amply prove what the author with pardonable pride asserts, that the Australian archives are surprisingly complete.

ANNIE HELOISE ABEL-HENDERSON.

The Foundation and Settlement of South Australia, 1829-1845: a Study of the Colonization Movement, based on the Records of the South

Australian Government and on other Authoritative Documents. By A. Grenfell Price, M.A., F.R.G.S. (Adelaide, F. W. Preece, 1924, pp. xii, 260, 18s. 6d.) As schoolmaster in St. Peter's College, Adelaide, and author of *South Australians and their Environment*, A. Grenfell Price, M.A. (Oxon.), is presumably well fitted to deal with the beginnings of the colony that was started in 1836 on Gulf St. Vincent, and, as the nephew of a pioneer coastal surveyor, he may be thought to have a predilection for the geographical aspect of historical development. It is his insistence upon the "Mediterranean character" of South Australia that gives to the work under review its chief claim to originality. In most other respects the narrative is little more than a reiteration and amplification of accounts already well known.

The author's point of view is frankly colonial, as distinct from imperial, and his sympathies capitalistic. This latter fact may easily account for his more or less complete ignoring of such vital subjects as education, religion, the press, and the common people, the laboring element, that is, of any Wakefield experiment. Concerning the treatment of the aborigines, he has virtually nothing to say except to remark that the colonizing scheme was delayed in execution because provisions for the safeguarding of aboriginal rights had been inadvertently omitted from the Foundation, or enabling, act of 1834.

Mr. Price's methods are on the whole scholarly, despite the occasional slovenliness of his style as instanced by his loose references to comparatively obscure men by surname only and his lack of preciseness in citation. In the use of the *Light Journal*, to mention only one of his much used sources, he is just a little careless; but of the manuscript and documentary material conveniently at hand in the Archives Department of the Adelaide Public Library and elsewhere he seems to have made a thorough and honest examination. The papers in the possession of the Mayo family as late as 1923 that bear upon the Light-Hindmarsh controversy seem, somehow or other, to have escaped his notice.

ANNIE HELOISE ABEL-HENDERSON.

The Voyages of Jacques Cartier. Published from the originals, with Translations, Notes, and Appendices, by H. P. Biggar, B.Litt., Chief Archivist for Canada in Europe. [Publications of the Public Archives of Canada, no. 11.] (Ottawa, King's Printer, 1924, pp. xiv, 330, maps.) Mr. Biggar has given us a text and translation of Cartier which may be regarded as definitive. The text of Cartier's first voyage (1534) is copied from the unique manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale. This had already been published in 1867 at Paris by its discoverer, M. Michéant, and in 1906 in facsimile by the late James Phinney Baxter of Portland, Maine; but it is characteristic of Mr. Biggar's careful work that by comparing the original word for word with Ramusio's Italian translation of 1556 he has been able to add in brackets several words and two

important phrases. His text of the second voyage (1535) is based on the Bibliothèque Nationale MS. no. 5589; but he has added, either in notes or in brackets, all the variations given in MSS. 5644 and 5653, and in the unique printed copy in the British Museum. The third voyage is reprinted from Hakluyt. The appendixes are of no great importance. The notes, both biographical and geographical, are models of care and skill. The translation is accurate and lucid.

Two criticisms only may be ventured. Among a number of excellent reproductions of rare sixteenth-century maps why has Mr. Biggar included a nineteenth-century picture of a sixteenth-century bourgeois in his Sunday finery, and called it Jacques Cartier? Again, is he not a little pedantic in his resolve to quote only first-hand evidence? Such studies as those of the Abbé Verreau, which disprove, *inter alia*, the possibility of Cartier's supposed fourth voyage, should have been mentioned. And why does Mr. Biggar refer to Lescarbot solely in the rare edition of 1609, rather than in that of 1618, which is not only a better edition, but has the great advantage of being easily accessible in the reprint of the Champlain Society, edited in part by Mr. Biggar himself? But these are small blemishes upon a work which is in all essentials worthy of the celebrated *archiviste-paléographe*, its editor.

W. L. GRANT.

Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts. Volume XXV. *Transactions, 1922-1924.* (Boston, the Society, 1924, pp. xvii, 474.) The volume has all the excellence of form and illustration, and all the elaborateness of editing, which its predecessors in the series have so laudably shown. The importance of the contents does not equal the merit of the form. The largest item, occupying ninety pages, is a series of documents illustrating the accused loyalty, during the Revolution, of a single township, Barnstable. Two other of the longest pieces are the log of a privateer of 1781-1782 and the biography of an unimportant scoundrel named Amos Windship, edited with wonderful elaboration. There are several interesting short pieces about the library, charter, and laws of Harvard College. Mr. C. B. Clapp traces to the University of Franeker the college motto, *Christo et Ecclesiae*. Mr. Percival Merritt, upon the basis of thorough-going investigation, presents praiseworthy biographies of Boston's first three Catholic priests—Bouchard de la Poterie, Rousselet, and John Thayer.

Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Volume LVII., October, 1923-June, 1924. (Boston, the Society, 1924, pp. xvi, 531.) As usual, Dr. Worthington C. Ford, the society's editor, is the chief contributor to the volume, having papers on Voting with Beans and Corn, on the First Separate Map of Pennsylvania, on Benjamin Harris, Printer and Bookseller, with a list of Harris's publications, and on Franklin's *New England Courant* and its discovery. The chief pieces of

original material are of the nineteenth century: a diary kept in 1831-1834 by Judge Charles P. Huntington of Northampton, of interest for the politics of the time, and the war letters of Charles P. Bowditch, 1863-1864. Of the essays contributed by members, the most important is that of Dr. Gardner W. Allen on Naval Convoys. Much interest also attaches to that of Hon. Charles Warren on Why Jefferson abandoned the Presidential Speech to Congress—the essential reason being that the wrangling over the conventional response by Congress had become such a nuisance; to that of Rev. Dr. Henry S. Burrage on Lincoln and the Civil War, containing some personal reminiscences; to that of Capt. T. G. Frothingham on the Peninsula Campaign of 1862, laudatory of McClellan; to that of Professor T. C. Smith on the Garfield-Blaine Tradition, of a supposed domination of Garfield by his Secretary of State; and to that of Mr. Robert L. O'Brien on the Personality of a Presidential Candidate (Cleveland). Of the commemorative pieces, the most interesting is that of Edward Stanwood, by C. K. Bolton. Speaking of Mr. Stanwood's carefulness about details, Mr. O'Brien says: "he wrote to me in Washington to see if I could find out when and why the 'Committee on Ways and Means' became the 'Committee of Ways and Means'. There appeared no larger reason for it than the careless inertia of the compilers of the *Congressional Directory*." Quite wrong; the original and proper designation is "Committee of Ways and Means", as may be seen by looking in the *House Journal* for July 24, 1789, when that committee was first appointed. So also "Committee of Elections". The phrase comes down, in that form, from the House of Commons of the seventeenth century, when that house had standing committees. Committee originally meant the individual person, later the group of persons, to whom a thing was committed, just as payee meant the person to whom a thing was paid. "Committee on Ways and Means" is, historically speaking, an unwarranted innovation.

American Colonial Architecture: its Origin and Development. By Joseph Jackson. (Philadelphia, David McKay Company, 1924, pp. viii, 228, \$2.00.) The historian should not expect a wholly critical and scientific treatment in this book, the work of a veteran journalist of Philadelphia. If, however, the reader takes it for what it is, he will be astonished at the number of admirable documentary bits and finger-posts to further material. The little drawings of English copyhold houses on page 35 are an excellent corrective of the belief that fine Colonial frame houses two stories high, two rooms wide and two deep, should be debonairly dated before 1650. The old Philadelphia photographs of Loxley Hall (destroyed 1859) and of the London Coffee-House (taken long before its demolition in 1883) are very welcome, and tend to deepen the reviewer's optimistic conviction, so often verified, that some photograph exists of almost every building which stood down to the days of photography, if one can only find it. The chapters on the French colonies,

slight as they are, are yet perhaps the most suggestive sketches yet attempted of this interesting and neglected phase of Colonial work. The historian will value most chapter XII., Builders, Bills and Books, in which Mr. Jackson transcribes and illustrates in facsimile a number of bills of members of the Carpenters Company in the eighteenth century. If other popular writers would give us a few solid documents like these we would even pardon them for including their own lucubrations.

FISKE KIMBALL.

The History of the United States Army. By William Addleman Ganoe, Major of Infantry, U. S. A. (New York and London, D. Appleton and Company, 1924, pp. xi, 609, \$5.00.) It is encouraging to note that the army is beginning to realize that it has a history. When that history is known and understood we shall be able to discuss problems of national defense on their merits. There have been many studies, partly historical, dealing with periods or phases, but Major Ganoe is the first to attempt a complete and connected history of the military establishment. His labor has evidently been great, and he is to be congratulated upon the result. He has given outlines of military operations, but he has treated these, not as the end and object of his work, but as mile-stones in the development of an essential element in the national governmental machinery. The book is evidently intended to appeal to the general public rather than to historical students; but it suggests so much of historical interest that it is to be hoped that the same writer or another may be led to further and more detailed work.

It would be pleasant to stop here; but a few blemishes must be mentioned. The most serious is the unfortunate tone of many passages. Our Revolutionary army, for instance, was not of as high individual character or collective efficiency as it is sometimes painted, but a depreciating or patronizing air toward it is not justified; and some of its peculiarities, noted with amusement or disapproval by the author, would have appeared less strange had he taken the trouble to familiarize himself with the European systems of the day. Again, Congress has not been conspicuous for its wisdom in handling military affairs; but it is neither fair nor wise to condemn that body utterly for its attitude, especially when one stops to recall some of the complaints that Congress might make against representatives of the army.

Less serious, perhaps, but annoying, is a certain carelessness in details. Taking examples at random, we find the passage on page 9, where the fine shooting of the Revolutionary rifle, which is correctly stated, might readily be attributed by the reader to the musket. On page 306, in discussion of the three-battalion regiments of the Civil War, it is implied that these were tactical units—the fact being that each battalion was used independently, like an English battalion. Troop units are often incorrectly given; thus, on page 369, credit is given for work on the Yukon to several regiments which were represented, if at all, only by

individuals, and no mention is made of the two regiments, the 8th Infantry and the 3d Artillery, which bore the brunt of that work in 1897 and 1898. And there is lack of accuracy in proof-reading, especially in proper names.

The epilogue is a glowing account of our recent war-time and post-war organization—perhaps a trifle too glowing for sober history. In the post-war discussion, the writer falls into an error unfortunately somewhat common just now. Properly approving the idea of developing a reserve, he confuses this end with a specific means, and assumes approval of present methods of organizing and handling it—a very different thing, about which there may be two opinions.

OLIVER L. SPAULDING, JR.

La Première Mission Officielle de la France aux États-Unis, Conrad-Alexandre Gérard, 1778-1779. By Wladimir d'Ormesson. (Paris, Édouard Champion, 1924, pp. xi, 227, 7 fr.) This little sketch is explained by the author as incidental to a life of Vergennes based on the correspondence of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs during that statesman's tenure of office. That there is a place for a careful and detailed study of Gérard's mission to the United States during the first two years of the French-American Alliance, most students of the beginnings of American diplomatic history would agree. A first glance at M. d'Ormesson's work, with its reference to documents from Vergennes's American correspondence, might suggest that this need has been met. Like so many dissertations on the French Alliance, much of the volume is only a summary of Doniol, except that citations are made to French Foreign Office archives rather than to the same documents easily accessible in Doniol. The critical problems of Gérard's mission, such as the Spanish mediation and American peace terms designed to meet it, the fisheries, the Mississippi question—these are mentioned only to be dismissed, with little analysis, in meaningless generalities. There is an unusual number of errors, even for a foreign writer, in dealing with American personalities, geography, even well-known historical facts. John Jay is confused with Horatio Gates; Gouverneur Morris, despite his familiarity to French historians, appears as "Governor Moriss"; Jefferson was not a member of the American commission to France in 1777-1778; Gérard's mission was not "continued successively by thirty-four ministers and three ambassadors" right down to M. Jusserand, but was broken off, as everyone knows, by the XYZ affair. The author mentions Corwin's brilliant study of the French Alliance in his brief bibliography attached to the preface, but prefers to ignore it afterward, in preference for DeWitt's archaic work on Jefferson and American Democracy. There is no mention of the well-known publications of Perkins and the E. E. Hales, and Phillips, to whose accounts little is added, nor to the more obscure studies of Miss Elizabeth Kite specifically on Gérard. Though the sketch may be a readable, if unreliable,

account for French students, it will not supplement to any useful degree the above mentioned American narratives nor the shorter elucidations of the French Alliance printed by Professor Van Tyne and others in this *Review*.

Select British Documents of the Canadian War of 1812. Edited, with an Introduction, by William Wood. Volume II. [Publications of the Champlain Society, vol. XIV.] (Toronto, the Society, 1923, pp. ix, 517.) This volume, in contrast to volume I., which was described in this journal for April, 1922, consists wholly of narrative documents and returns relating to military and naval operations of 1813 along the frontier lines stretching from Detroit to Lake Champlain. The presentation of these documents in seven groups (III.-IX.) is generous in form, even sumptuous, a veritable edition *de luxe*. In it elaborate, formal subscriptions to letters are repeatedly printed, meticulously full even up to eight lines.

The choice of documents brings out very clearly the difficulties experienced by the commanders in Canada in maintaining even a semblance of an army along the line of wilderness posts and the rudiments of a navy on Lakes Erie and Ontario. The rawness of recruits, the instability and caprice of their Indian allies, the vast difficulties of transportation of artificers such as shipwrights, fighting men, munitions, supplies, and the raw materials for building and equipping forts and ships are set forth with vivid clearness. The complaints of commanders on the Canadian side echo those on the side of the United States as to the greed of traders and inhabitants; the obstacles to recruiting both soldiers and seamen and the conflict of counsels are well brought out. The would-be ship-builders on Lake Ontario were "totally destitute" of cables, pitch, and tar; on the eve of the battle of Lake Erie, Major-General Proctor reports that there were not twenty-five "valorous and well-disciplined" men on board his Majesty's vessels on that lake, when at least three hundred were needed.

Among the most important documents in this volume are those relating to the battle of Lake Erie (pp. 243-319), including the correspondence of General Proctor and Captain Barclay and the Lake Erie court-martial papers from the Public Record Office in London. A large section of the documents in group VIII. (pp. 359-429) relates to the battle of Chateauguay and especially to the difficulties of Lieutenant-Colonel de Salaberry in securing credit according to his own estimates for his efforts in the battle. The noise of this controversy not only reached the house of assembly of Lower Canada, but penetrated almost to the steps of the throne itself, as a letter from the Duke of Kent at Kensington Palace to the gallant but disgruntled colonel shows very clearly. The documents relating to the operations at Chrystler's Farm in November and on the Niagara frontier in December illustrate again the discriminating judgment of the editor.

KENDRIC C. BABCOCK.

Economic Aspects of Southern Sectionalism, 1840-1861. By Robert Royal Russel, Ph.D. [University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. XI., nos. 1, 2.] (Urbana, the University, 1923, pp. 325, \$2.00.) About 1820 the South became aware of the fact that it was not keeping pace with the North in economic progress and for the next forty years it devoted considerable energy to the task of finding remedies for its "decline". This "decline" the South identified with economic dependence on the North and attributed to the partiality of federal legislation. Successful war was waged against the tariff and contradictory movements were started for direct trade with Europe, for the diversification of Southern industry, and for local protective legislation against Northern products. Still the "decline" persisted, Southern wealth still went to make Northern profits, and the winter of Southern discontent continued unbroken, though somewhat mitigated by the prosperous decade of the 'fifties. In a final effort to win economic independence the South played its trump card, secession.

The author is only incidentally concerned with the facts of the case. His book is a study of public opinion. His foot-notes and extensive bibliography indicate the pains he has taken to ascertain what this public opinion really was. The study reveals a number of things: that the South was astonishingly vocal, that it was not opposed to tariffs in theory, and that it meant what it said when it asserted that it did not secede over a question of slavery.

But public opinion is a will-o'-the-wisp; no one can ever be sure he has found it. To the reviewer it seems that the author's judgments are not always good and righteous altogether. It is to be doubted if any considerable part of the South was ever hostile to slavery, if there was any great importation of slaves after 1808, if DeBow could justly be called a disunion leader. But the final judgment must be that the book is a distinct contribution to the discovery of the old South.

R. S. COTTERILL.

Frederick Law Olmsted: a Critic of the Old South. By Broadus Mitchell, Ph.D. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, series XLII., no. 2.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1924, pp. 158, \$1.50.) A remarkably good book about a most remarkable man. Ever since editions of Olmsted's most valuable books of observations on the ante-bellum South began to appear in the 1850's, readers have longed for such a volume as the present one. This book should at once take its place upon library shelves as an indispensable companion of the Olmsted volumes. Among the present generation of historical scholars, surely all have read Olmsted; yet few could say anything more about the author than that he evidently was a keen observer and a reporter quite faithful. The first chapter of the present volume, some fifty pages, will answer many a query which has arisen in the minds of Olmsted's readers, as to who the man was, what his interests and

activities were prior to his memorable journeys, what his preparation and fitness for his observations. And the result will be to enhance a confidence which probably already existed to some degree on faith. The first chapter will be of interest and profit to all, whether they have read, or are about to read, Olmsted. The second and third chapters are headed "The Critic of the Ante-bellum South" and "The Economic Effects of Slavery". These constitute a critical review and evaluation of Olmsted's accounts. The author knows well the other writers of the time on the same subject, and compares and contrasts them with Olmsted. One might object that these two chapters are not well organized, that there is overlapping, and that they smack of the rambling character of Olmsted's writings. Again, in facing the old question of how many of the shortcomings of the South in that period were due to slave labor, and how many to the deficiencies of negro labor, one is still left in doubt. There is still room for debate on some economic aspects of the ante-bellum system. However, these two chapters are an excellent short-cut to most that is important in Olmsted and some other writers.

C. S. BOUCHER.

Conscription and Conflict in the Confederacy. By Albert Burton Moore, Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of Alabama. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1924, pp. xi, 367, \$3.00.) The monograph of Dr. Moore shows that nowhere was the fundamental political weakness of the Confederacy exhibited more clearly than in the handling of the difficult problem of conscription. The theory of state sovereignty upon which the secession was based made impossible the unquestioned submission of local authorities to the drastic Confederate legislation. The author develops with a wealth of detail the story of the Confederate struggle to obtain men to fight the unequal battle. First he describes the raising of troops by volunteering and by state action early in the war; then follows an analysis of the conscript legislation and administration and the resulting conflicts between the Richmond and the state authorities, with some account of the judicial decisions, Confederate and state, on questions involving the conscription acts; the concluding chapters contain an estimate of the efficiency of the system in the various parts of the South and as a whole.

As the story unfolds one is constantly reminded of the more efficient handling of the draft of 1917-1918 under quite different conditions. It is quite clear now that the Confederate policy was applied under almost impossible conditions. There was probably no other way, yet it was unsuited to the political temperament of the Southern leaders. State officials were jealous of Confederate encroachment. The personnel of the Bureau of Conscription was of poor quality. Between those charged with the work of the regular conscription and the advocates of military conscription by the armies there was rivalry and wrangling. The color of disgrace was attached to conscription. All these influences counted

against efficient administration and compare most unfavorably with the forces supporting the draft of 1917-1918.

Especially interesting is Dr. Moore's marshalling of facts about the exemption policy and the use of substitutes. Unwarlike men swelled the ranks of the teaching and preaching professions. Many drug-stores without drugs were opened; the pettiest offices of town, county, and state were much sought after; "skilled" labor was abundant; and registration showed an unexpected number of "foreigners". Substitutes were advertised for at \$500 to \$10,000 each.

Two good chapters are devoted to the rivalry of the two Confederate conscription agencies—the Bureau of Conscription at Richmond under civilian control and the Military Bureau conducted by General Pillow for the armies of Generals Bragg and Johnston. But the chief source of trouble and weakness was the stubborn conduct of some state governors—notably Governors Vance of North Carolina and Brown of Georgia. It is not too much to say that these, with Vice-President Stephens, Robert Toombs, and Senator Foote, were worth many regiments to the Union cause. Dr. Moore has made good use of his material and has written a good book.

Labor Disputes and the President of the United States. By Edward Berman, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. CXI., no. 2.] (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1924, pp. 284, \$3.00.) Mr. Berman's study of the ways in which the Presidents have met the emergency problems of labor disputes begins and ends with accounts of sweeping injunctions against railroad strikes. Midway it gives the very different railroad story of the Adamson Act, and the other incidents run the gamut from the use of McKinley's troops to force miners to sign "yellow-dog contracts" in the Coeur d'Alènes (which the author condemns) to the use of Wilson's troops to keep strike-breakers out of Colorado (which the author approves). The narrative is a dramatic one, and a skillful choice of quotations throws much light on the intentions of the Presidents and their agents. What consistent element runs through their varied actions? Little but "a single principle", answers the author, "that of expediency. . . . The policy . . . has been one of waiting and in many instances not even of watchful waiting".

This conclusion is well sustained by Mr. Berman's evidence, and his own suggestions for a programme of more watchful and more intelligent waiting, particularly in the cases of coal and railroads, are temperate and worthy of consideration. He sees clearly, moreover, that the emergency issues of ending strikes (and saving what the application for the Daugherty injunction called "the frozen faces of the famishing public") must not be considered "regardless of fairness" in the use of the government's great power in the struggle between unions and employers. He fails, however, to relate this problem to those other acts of government which

do in fact throw its influence into the industrial balance and which a "constructive governmental labor policy" must also take into account. For the most significant "interventions of Presidents in labor disputes" are often their appointments to the Supreme Court, and the Coppage and Hitchman cases are a part of the same problem with the Adamson Act and the affair of the Coeur d'Alènes.

CARTER GOODRICH.

The Big Sandy Valley: a Regional History prior to the Year 1850. By Willard Rouse Jillson, Sc.D., State Geologist of Kentucky. (Louisville, Ky., John P. Morton and Company, 1923, pp. 183, \$2.50.) The book under review is one of the signs that the Kentucky mountains so long abandoned to the sociologist and the novelist are now in the process of being reclaimed by the historian. The importance of the *Big Sandy Valley* is that it deals with a mountain region whose history has been hitherto practically unwritten.

In the first chapter, on geologic history, the author, the state geologist, speaks as one having authority and not as a mere scribe or historian. He treats with geological irreverence the redoubtable legends of Swift's silver mines and displays acute reserve in discussing the tradition of the Washington surveys in the valley. The account of the exploration of the region and the Indian warfare does not go much beyond that of the larger state histories, but for the later period Dr. Jillson has drawn on county records and manuscript material for a multitude of new facts. Lists of actual settlers are given, the rise of settlements in the upper and lower valley is sketched, and the social, religious, and economic development is recounted. The chief quarrel the reader will have with the book is its terminal; 1850 is a date preceding the most significant development of the region.

The style is agreeable throughout, and errors, typographical and other, are few. There is one colossal mistake in a date (p. 47). There is an appendix showing the division of the region into counties, a bibliography of 125 titles, and a very complete index.

R. S. COTTERILL.

COMMUNICATION

To the Managing Editor:

The reviewer of my *Washington's Southern Tour* says: "The historical student will . . . be astonished at Professor Henderson's use of his imagination to supply matter which he thinks plausible but for which there is no foundation." The example which he cites is on page 71, where a picture is drawn of the greetings to Washington in his white chariot with its liveried outriders—the farmer leaving his ploughshare to stare at the coach and cavalcade, and to give vent to his enthusiasm in cheers. My comment on the scene described is as follows (p. 71): "We must imagine these scenes, for they assuredly occurred—and frequently; but Washington makes no mention of them in the pages of his diary." The reviewer comments on my comment as follows: "'Assuredly', to borrow the author's own word, this is not history. Neither from his own gathering of facts, nor from any word in Washington's diary itself, do we find any evidence to show whether the farmers along the roadsides greeted the President with enthusiasm or let him pass unnoticed."

The questions at issue between the reviewer and myself are: first, did the farmers along the roadsides greet Washington with enthusiasm, and leave their work to assemble in throngs to receive and welcome him—either by my own gathering of facts or by reliable contemporary evidence; and second, is or is not, therefore, what I have written on this point "history"?

For the sake of the reader who has not the book at hand to refer to, I will briefly cite evidence on the first point. In North Carolina, to take a single instance, the farmers did not merely leave their work for a moment to greet the President as he passed: they actually deserted their farms for the day and brought their families in wagons to Charlotte, where they greeted Washington with every mark of enthusiasm. In speaking of Washington's visit to Charlotte in 1791, the late Dr. George W. Graham ("The Historic Localities of Mecklenburg County", *Charlotte Observer*, December 25, 1893) says: "The visit called forth the warmest enthusiasm on the part of the people and they assembled in great numbers to see him." In his "Washington in Charlotte" (*Charlotte Observer*, January 9, 1898), G. R. Prowell says: "On this eventful Saturday [of May 28, 1791], crowds of people on foot, on horseback, and the better order of

peasantry in vehicles, came to this little village of Charlotte to catch a glimpse of Washington. It was the first and only time that many of them had seen the tall dignified form of the man who will always be marked as the greatest American. The streets and adjoining roads were lined with men, women and children for hours before his arrival, for it was not as a certainty known when he would reach Charlotte" (*Washington's Southern Tour*, pp. 287-288). Washington's companion, Charles Caldwell, on the ride to Charlotte spoke to Washington as follows: "We shall arrive at Charlotte to-morrow morning, where you will be enthusiastically received, by five hundred at least—perhaps twice the number, of the most respectable inhabitants of the country; a large portion of whom served, in some capacity, in the revolutionary war—several of them, I believe, as officers and privates, under your own command. When I passed through the town yesterday morning, a large number of them had already assembled, and the crowd was rapidly increasing. And they are exceedingly provident. Convinced that they cannot all be supplied in the town, with either food or lodging, many of them have brought with them large and well-covered farm wagons, for their bed-chambers, and enough of substantial food, already cooked, for a week's subsistence. Others again have already erected, and are still erecting, for their temporary residence, in the midst of a beautiful and celebrated grove (where a victory was gained, by a company of militia riflemen, over a party of Tarleton's dragoons), the very tents under which they slept as soldiers, in the service of their country" (*Washington's Southern Tour*, pp. 284-285).

George Washington Parke Custis, the President's stepson, in his *Recollections and Private Memoirs of Washington*, after describing the firing of the cannon when the "white chariot" hove into view, says: "Revolutionary veterans hurried from all directions once more to greet their beloved chief. They called it marching to headquarters; and as the dear glorious old fellows would overtake their neighbors and friends, they would say, 'Push on, my boys, if you wish to see him; for we, who ought to know, can assure you that he is never behind time, but always punctual to the moment'. It was thus that Washington performed his memorable tour of the United States—everywhere received with heartfelt homage that the love, veneration, and gratitude of a whole people could bestow; and there is no doubt yet living a gray head who can tell of the time when he gallantly rode to some village or inn on the long-remembered route to hail the arrival of the white chariot, and join in the joyous welcome

to the Father of his Country" (*Washington's Southern Tour*, p. 292).

Sufficient evidence has been cited here, surely, to convince any trained historical student that the Southern people adored Washington, felt the greatest curiosity to see him, and left their work, their homes, their business, and often travelled long distances in order merely to see the gay cavalcade pass, to gaze upon the benign face of the paternal Washington, and to cheer him to the echo (the last being repeatedly mentioned in contemporary accounts cited in *Washington's Southern Tour*).

Washington's enemies, in particular Bache, protested against Washington's "stately journeyings through the American continent in search of personal incense"; and Callender declared that "the extravagant popularity possessed by this citizen reflects the utmost ridicule on the discernment of America" (*Washington's Southern Tour*, pp. xxiii-xxiv). Indeed, the adulation of Washington by all the people actually astounded some of Washington's Virginia contemporaries. For example, there is Richard N. Venable (1763-1838) of Prince Edward County, Virginia, a graduate of Princeton (1782), whose diary (1791-1792) is printed in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, October, 1920 (II. 135-138). The following entries (cited in *Washington's Southern Tour*, p. 324) strikingly confirm the historical accuracy of the scene under discussion, which the cocksure reviewer so signally fails to impugn:

"Monday 6th June [1791]. At Charlotte Court House. Great anxiety in the people to see Gen'l Washington. Strange is the impulse which is felt by almost every breast to see the face of a great good man—sensation better felt than expressed. In evening [I] came to Prince Edward C.H.

"Tuesday, 7th June. Gen'l Washington arrived at Prince Edward Court House, all crowding the way where they expect him to pass, anxious to see the Saviour of their Country and object of their love."

Let me also cite a letter written by Colonel Clement Carrington (1762-1847), owned by Mr. Mayo Brown of Lynchburg, Virginia, and called to my attention through the kindness of Dr. Philip Alexander Bruce of Charlottesville, Virginia. In the letter referred to, of date June 25, 1791, written by Colonel Carrington from his home in Charlotte County to his brother-in-law, William Cabell, jr., he says: "The beloved President passed lately through the county [Charlotte]. He rested a day with Mr. Coles. He is in perfect

health. We did not address as is the custom; but the laborer forsook his work and the lame forgot his crutch to gaze on him as he passed and we looked at him without mercy."

"Assuredly", the scene I have described (*Washington's Southern Tour*, p. 71), on the basis of which the reviewer seeks to discredit me as an historical writer, is "history".

ARCHIBALD HENDERSON.

CORRECTION

By an unfortunate typographical error, made after the last proofs of our October number went to the printer, the lines on page 36, in the appendix to Major Temperley's article, have appeared in a disjointed form. To put them into correct shape, the reader should, in the left-hand column on that page, depress by two lines the dates from June 30 to August 31, and by one line the dates from September 5 to October 9.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The programme of the thirty-ninth annual meeting of the American Historical Association was sent out on December 2, and the meeting, by the time this issue of the *Review* is published, has taken place in Richmond, December 27-30. The committee of arrangements in Richmond provided an excursion on the 31st to Williamsburg, Jamestown, and Yorktown. The Washington members offered a dinner in Washington, on January 2, to the British guests attending the Anglo-American Conference of Professors of History which was a feature of the Richmond meeting. While the Association was holding its meeting in Richmond, the Society for the History of Science met in Washington.

The Superintendent of Documents has distributed vol. II. of the *Annual Report* for 1919, being the report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission for that year. The volume, published in two parts (pp. 1-1006 and 1007-1824), is entirely occupied with the first installment of the Austin papers, papers of Moses Austin extending from 1789 to 1821 and of Stephen F. Austin from 1810 to 1827. The present installment embraces nearly 2000 letters or documents, those of 1789-1796 mostly originating in Virginia, those of 1797-1829 mostly in St. Louis and the regions of the Louisiana Territory, those from 1820 on relating to Texas and the Austin colony there.

The annual bibliography, *Writings on American History*, for 1921 (pp. xxii, 272), prepared with the usual extraordinary care by Miss Grace G. Griffin, has been distributed to those members who have requested it. The volume for 1922 has been read in galley-proof, and will be supplied to members as soon as the operations of the Government Printing Office permit. The present volume embraces 3283 items, a larger number than in any issue since that for 1914. The composition of the volume being what it is, and the same from year to year, formal review of it may seem impracticable or superfluous, but nothing should prevent an annual recognition of its high merit as bibliography, of its value to students of American history, and of the indebtedness of the Association to Miss Griffin for her devoted labors in their behalf.

After a special meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies held in New York on December 6, public announcement was made of the name of the benefactor who is making possible the production of the proposed *Dictionary of American Biography*. A work in some twenty large volumes is contemplated, embracing fifteen or twenty thousand biographies—but including no living persons—the biographies to be

the product of fresh work, scholarly, impartial, objective, and prepared by writers specially qualified in each case. It is estimated that the manuscript of such a dictionary, prepared as it ought to be prepared, will cost not less than half a million dollars. The *New York Times*, through its publisher, Mr. Adolph S. Ochs, entertaining a high sense of the value of the undertaking, and warmly desirous of seeing it adequately carried out, agrees to advance that great sum. Since without such advance the enterprise could not be carried out, the *Dictionary* is, in a very real sense, the *Times's* gift to the nation. We can not in any moderate terms express our sense of Mr. Ochs's generosity or of the intelligent perception of national interests shown by the *Times*. May the *Dictionary* do for America what the *Dictionary of National Biography* has done for the patriotism as well as the scholarship of the British nation!

The *New York Times* will neither manufacture nor publish the *Dictionary*, will exercise no control over its contents and assume no responsibility for its statements. The editorial offices will be established in Washington. A Committee of Management, already constituted, will presently choose an editor; it will make the needful arrangements with a publisher. The committee now consists of the following six members: J. F. Jameson, chairman, Dr. John H. Finley, treasurer, Professor Frederic L. Paxson, Mrs. Iphigene Ochs Sulzberger, Professor Carl Van Doren, and Hon. Charles Warren. The editor, when chosen, will be a seventh member. It is planned that the first volume shall appear within four years of the beginning of editorial work, and the subsequent volumes at the rate of three volumes thereafter. The contract between the American Council of Learned Societies (now an incorporated body) and the *New York Times* Company was signed at the meeting of the Council mentioned above.

At the same meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies, it was announced that no. 3 of its *Bulletin*, prepared by Mr. W. G. Leland, reporting the transactions of the Council and of the Union Académique Internationale during the past two years, would be distributed by January 1. The survey of the history, constitutions, activities, and status of the various national humanistic societies of the United States, and of their relation to its intellectual life, which Mr. Leland has been preparing for the Council at the instance of the Carnegie Corporation, will be completed and printed early in the year, as another *Bulletin*, of perhaps 150 or 200 pages, and will be a document of great value to those interested in the progress of humanistic studies in this country. The Carnegie Corporation has appropriated \$8000 to the use of the Council during 1925. Mr. Leland will during that year devote half his time to the work of the Council, as its executive secretary, the other half to that of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Informal reports of progress on the international dictionary of medieval Latin and other undertakings of the UAI and the Council were rendered.

PERSONAL

Henry Cabot Lodge, senator from Massachusetts and president of the Massachusetts Historical Society, died on November 9, at the age of seventy-four. His service in Congress began in 1887; before that time he had made an early reputation in history by his *Life and Letters of George Cabot* (1877) and his *Short History of the English Colonies in America* (1881), of which the significant part was the remarkable chapters on the individual colonies in 1765. He also prepared notable biographies of Hamilton and Washington in the *American Statesmen* series. Besides these and his *Story of the Revolution* (1898) he published many historical essays.

Miss Penelope McDuffie, head of the department of history in Converse College, died on November 21. She left nearly completed the manuscript for her expected book on the life of Senator Willie P. Mangum.

John Henry Vaughan, professor of history and economics in the New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, died on October 26.

On August 16 occurred the death of the veteran Alsatian historian Rodolphe Reuss, at the age of eighty-two, and also that of Édouard Rott, aged seventy, the learned editor of the Swiss government's series of volumes on the *Relations Diplomatiques de la France avec les Cantons Suisses*.

Miss Vera Lee Brown, who taught formerly at McGill University and at Wilson College, has been appointed assistant professor of history in Smith College.

Dr. Max Farrand, professor of history in Yale University for the last sixteen years, has presented his resignation to the Yale Corporation. He intends to devote his time to study and writing.

Leave of absence for the second half of the year has been given to Professor Lynn Thorndike of Columbia University and he will spend it in Europe.

Julius W. Pratt of the department of English in the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis has been made assistant professor of history in Rutgers College.

Miss Elizabeth B. White, hitherto of Clark University, has been made professor of history and dean of women in Ursinus College in Pennsylvania.

At DePauw University Miss Katharine S. Alvord has been promoted from associate professor to professor of history.

Professor Bernadotte E. Schmitt, formerly of Western Reserve University, has been appointed professor of modern history in the University of Chicago.

Professor W. S. Robertson of the University of Illinois has leave of absence during the present academic year, and is spending it in research in Latin American history in the libraries and archives of England, France, Portugal, and Spain. Dr. A. O. Craven, formerly of the Michigan Agricultural College, has been appointed assistant professor of history in the University of Illinois.

Dr. Joseph Schafer, superintendent of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, has been appointed a lecturer in history in the University of Wisconsin for the second semester of the year 1924-1925, and will give a course of lectures in the history of the West, substituting for Professor F. L. Paxson, who will spend that semester in Europe on leave.

GENERAL

The next International Congress of Americanists will be held in Rome in 1926.

In Georg Schneider's *Handbuch der Bibliographie* (second ed., Leipzig, Hiersemann, 1924, pp. xvi, 544) the student will find a repertory, much more complete than those in the works of Petzholdt, Stein, or Langlois, including sections on bibliographies of bibliographies, general international and national bibliographies, bibliographies of rare books and of incunabula, lists of selected books, general catalogues of libraries, of learned societies, of official and academic publications, and the like, making it a tool of great value.

Édouard Rahir's *La Bibliothèque de l'Amateur; Guide Sommaire à travers les Livres les plus Estimés* (Paris, Lefrançois, 1924, pp. lx, 718) is a work of value, first published in 1907, of which a second edition has been long awaited. The original plan has been preserved, but there have been numerous revisions and additions; the first two parts, "Livres recherchés pour le Texte" and "Livres Illustrés" from the fifteenth century to our time, have been more than doubled, as well as the "Répertoire Alphabétique des Ouvrages cités", which follows.

Two works of value on the history of art are the *Grundriss der Kunstgeschichte* by P. A. Kuhn (Einsiedeln, Benziger, 1924, pp. viii, 360) and the *Deutsche und Französische Kunst im Mittelalter*, I., *Südfranzösische Protorenaissance und ihre Ausbreitung in Deutschland*; II., *Die Baugeschichte der Klosterkirche zu Lehnin und die Normannische Invasion* by R. Hamann (Marburg, Kunstgeschichtliches Seminar, 1922-1923, 2 vols., pp. iv, 140; iv, 180).

The October number of the *Historical Outlook* contains an article by Professor Paul V. B. Jones on Italy since the Great War. In the November number appears the address by Professor Frederick J. Turner, delivered before Clark University on Founder's Day, Feb. 4, 1924, mentioned in our July number (XXIX. 845). It is entitled Since the Foundation of Clark University, 1889-1924. The December number con-

stitutes the third Year Book of the National Council for the Social Studies, and the contents are chiefly articles respecting phases and problems of these studies.

The *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society at the meeting of April, 1923, contain an account by Major William B. Lewis of the nomination of Jackson in 1824, presented by Professor John S. Bassett, a description of the Isaiah Thomas collection of American ballads, with bibliographical list, by Dr. Worthington C. Ford, and a large body of letters, 1803-1807, of Rev. Samuel Taggart, who for seven terms represented a Massachusetts district in Congress, and describes its doings minutely. Professor George H. Haynes supplies an introduction.

The contents of the second number of the *Cambridge Historical Journal* differ widely from what we predicted in a previous number (XXIX. 822). There are articles on Some Aspects of Local Autonomy in the Roman Empire, by Professor J. Stuart Reid; on the Marshals of the Eyre, by Miss Helen M. Cam; on Napoleon's Sea Power (an exceptionally weighty article), by Professor J. Holland Rose; on British Policy in the Publication of Diplomatic Documents under Castlereagh and Canning, by Professor C. K. Webster and H. W. V. Temperley; and on Lord Elgin in India, 1862-1863, by Professor J. L. Morrison. Dr. Gooch prints a score of extracts from the unpublished papers of Lord John Russell, illustrative of the Eastern Crisis of 1840. Editors of composite historical works, and their contributors, will value the accounts of the late Sir Adolphus Ward's editorial methods given by Sir Stanley Leathes and Dr. Gooch.

The chief articles in the October number of *History* are one by M. L. W. Laistner on the Revival of Greek in Western Europe in the Carolingian Age, and one by E. F. Jacob on the question What were the "Provisions of Oxford"? Professor C. E. Fryer of Montreal discusses the evidences as to the General Election of 1784.

Articles in the October number of the *Catholic Historical Review* are: the Church and Humanism, by Dr. J. F. Leibold; Erasmus, the Sorbonne, and the Index, by Maurice Wilkinson; Hugo Grotius and his Place in the History of International Peace, by Rev. Max G. Rupp; Early Eighteenth-Century Catholics in England, by R. C. Wilton, librarian of Arundel Castle; and Some Papal Privileges of the English Benedictines, by Dr. Alfred H. Sweet.

The June number of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* includes a paper by Miriam T. Murphy on Catholic Missionary Work among the Colored People of the United States, 1776-1866. The October number contains an article by Rev. Owen B. Corrigan, auxiliary bishop of Baltimore, entitled a Model Country Parish and its Records; a biographical sketch of Major-Gen. W. S. Rosecrans, by Rev. Lawrence W. Mulhane; and an account of the Work of the Sisters of Mercy in

the Diocese of Philadelphia, 1861-1875, in the Archdiocese, 1875-1921, and in the Dioceses of Altoona, Brooklyn, Albany, and Ogdensburg, by Sister Mary Eulalia Herron.

The October number of the *Journal of Negro History* is almost entirely occupied by the concluding portion (pp. 180) of Mr. A. A. Taylor's monograph on *The Negro in South Carolina during the Reconstruction*. It may be convenient for students to know that this monograph (pp. 275), and several others that have appeared in the *Journal*, can be had in separate form by application to the Associated Publishers, 1538 Ninth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. Such are Dr. Woodson's *A Century of Negro Migration*, Dr. Sherwood's *Paul Cuffee*, Dr. McDougles's *Slavery in Kentucky*, Dr. Zook's *The Company of Royal Adventurers Trading into Africa*, and Justice Riddell's *The Slave in Canada*. Dr. Woodson, editor of the *Journal* and director of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, announces a full statistical report, drawn off from the United States census of 1830, on the *Free Negro Heads of Families in the United States in 1830* (pp. 300).

Mention has been made in these pages of the English series, published by Messrs. Kegan Paul, corresponding to, and partly translated from, M. Henri Berr's series called *L'Évolution de l'Humanité*. Of the English series, called *The History of Civilization*, the first two volumes have now been published—*Social Organization*, by the late Dr. W. H. R. Rivers, edited by W. J. Perry, reader in cultural anthropology in the University of London, and *The Earth before History: Man's Origin and the Origin of Life*, translated from the French of Edmond Perrier (reviewed already, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVIII. 347).

The history department of Dartmouth College sets an example which might well be followed elsewhere by sending to the alumni an eight-page leaflet noting and briefly describing some sixty recent books of European and American history which may be useful to reading alumni.

The *Historische Zeitschrift* undertakes the publication, in a series of *Beihefte*, of monographs too long to be made articles in the journal itself. The first is *Calvins Staatsanschauung und das Konfessionelle Zeitalter*, by Dr. Hans Baron (Munich and Berlin, R. Oldenbourg, pp. 130); the second is a third edition of the late Professor Ernst Troeltsch's *Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der Modernen Welt* (pp. 110).

Martinus Nijhoff, the Hague, announces the publication, in a first series of five volumes, of *Monumenta Cartographica*, being reproductions of unique and rare maps, plans, and views, in the actual size of the originals, accompanied by cartographical monographs, edited by Dr. F. C. Wieder, librarian of the University of Leiden. The researches of Dr. Wieder and others have brought to light so many early maps hitherto

unknown, particularly of the later sixteenth and earlier seventeenth century, that such a publication, including also some important printed maps, will have great value.

The American Geographical Society, on the basis of the large collection of topographical maps of the eighteenth and other centuries presented to it by Mr. Francis Burton Harrison, presents a little illustrated pamphlet (pp. 38) on *Early Topographical Maps: their Geographical and Historical Value*.

Two volumes of *Histoire du Congrès des Religions*, being papers read at the congress held in Paris in October, 1923, papers of a very wide variety of contents, are published by the house of Champion.

Professor Wilbur C. Abbott's *Conflicts with Oblivion* (Yale University Press) embraces studies on Col. John Scott of Long Island, Col. Thomas Blood, Samuel Pepys, Sir William Monson, Disraeli, Bede, and Sir John Wentworth.

The Riddle of the Pacific (London, Fisher Unwin), by J. Macmillan Brown, chancellor of the University of New Zealand, is based on years of anthropological and archaeological research among the Pacific Islands.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. M. Trevelyan, *History and Literature* (Yale Review, October); Max Springer, *Das Selbstbestimmungsrecht in der Geschichte* (Preussische Jahrbücher, September); Hugo Preller, *Politik und Wirtschaft als Funktionen der Allgemeinen Kulturlage* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, August); A. Guérard, *The "New History": H. G. Wells and Voltaire* (Scribner's Magazine, November); anon., *The Practical Value of Military History* (Army Quarterly, October); Lieut. W. J. Nunnally, jr., U. S. N., *The Origin of Naval Law* (U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings, November).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General reviews: Maurice Besnier, *Chronique d'Histoire Ancienne Grecque et Romaine; l'Année 1923* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); a full summary of archaeological discoveries in Greek lands in the years 1916-1922, with discussion of the more significant, by B. Schweitzer, is published in the *Archäologische Anzeiger* for 1922, cols. 238-345.

Sir E. A. Wallis Budge published last year a facsimile transcript and translation, in the *Egyptian Hieratic Papyri of the British Museum*, of the long roll of the Teaching of Amen-en-apt, son of Ka-nekht, a document of great importance for the history of religious and moral ideas in Egypt, and for its relation to the Biblical Book of Proverbs. He now publishes a revised version (London, Martin Hopkinson), with accompaniments intended for the general reader, under the title *The Wisdom of the Egyptians*.

Assyrian Medical Texts from the Originals in the British Museum, by R. Campbell Thompson (Oxford University Press), and *The Assyrian Herbal*, by the same (London, Luzac), are mutually complementary, the former containing cuneiform texts the contents of which are explained and illustrated in the second. The books are of great value for their special subject, and thus for the early history of medicine in general.

The Annals of Sennacherib, texts and translations, by Daniel D. Luckenbill, is vol. II. of the *Oriental Institute Publications* of the University of Chicago; it comprises all Sennacherib's published inscriptions, and the text and translation of another prism, hitherto unpublished, the latest extant dated document of that king's annals, which is now in the possession of the Institute.

The Historical Development of Hebrew Law, by Hugh E. Willis, is among the *Indiana University Studies*.

Those interested in classic art will find a masterly introduction to one of its most important phases in Charles Dugas's *La Céramique Grecque* (Paris, Payot, 1924, pp. 158).

Dr. T. R. Glover's *Herodotus* (Cambridge University Press, pp. xvi, 302), full of knowledge and charm, is composed of lectures given in America.

Corrado Barbagallo, an author of numerous works of distinction in the field of ancient history, offers in *Il Tramonto di una Civiltà o la Fine della Grecia Antica* (Florence, Le Monnier, 1924, 2 vols., pp. xxiii, 222, 221) the second edition, completely revised, of a previously published work, emphasizing economic and social features.

Dr. D. Randall MacIver's illustrated volume on *Villanovans and Early Etruscans: a Study of the Early Iron Age in Italy* (Oxford University Press) aims at summing up all the material on the subject accumulated in recent years by Italian museums and scholars.

A useful little guide for the novice is furnished by L. Perret's *Les Inscriptions Latines, Bibliographie Pratique* (Paris, Klincksieck, 1924, pp. 42), the first part of which contains a list of publications on epigraphy since 1914, while the second part gives practical suggestions for this study.

The Yale University Press is publishing, for the Hispanic Society of America, *Fossil Man in Spain*, by Hugo Obermaier, professor of prehistoric archaeology in the University of Madrid, a volume of more than 500 pages, with many illustrations, some of them in color. The volume covers the glacial and palaeolithic periods, and the transitional phases from palaeolithic to neolithic.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Walther Wolf, *Vorläufer der Reformation Echnatons* (*Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache und Alter-*

tumskunde, LIX. 2); Wilhelm Spiegelberg, *Der gegenwärtige Stand und die nächsten Aufgaben der Demotischen Forschung* (*ibid.*); P. Roussel, *Les Inscriptions de Délos*, concl. (*Journal des Savants*, July); A. B. West, *Pericles' Political Heirs*, I., II. (*Classical Philology*, April, July); *id.*, *The Early Diplomacy of Philip II. of Macedon illustrated by his Coins* (*Numismatic Chronicle*, fifth series, III.); René Cagnat, *La Véritable Carthage* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, October 15); L. A. Constans, *La Route d'Hannibal du Rhône aux Alpes* (*Revue Historique*, September); Andreas Alföldi, *Der Untergang der Römerherrschaft in Pannonien* (*Ungarische Jahrbücher*, June).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

General review: the July–October issue of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* continues its exhaustive bibliography of books and magazine articles published in 1923 and 1924, running in this number to 147 pages.

An article by Professor Edward K. Rand in the *Harvard Theological Review* for July, on Dom Quentin's Memoir on the Text of the Vulgate, gives a valuable account of the remarkable methods which Dom Quentin has followed, under the auspices of the pontifical commission, and of their application to the different families of manuscripts.

On the premise that the history of ideas and of institutions is intimately connected with the history of words, the *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense* is undertaking an exhaustive study of the term "sacrament", which bids fair to supersede all previous work on the subject; a beginning is made under the title *Pour l'Histoire du Mot "Sacramentum"*, I. *Les Anténicéens* (Louvain, *Spicilegium Sac. Lov.*, fasc. 3, 1924, pp. x, 394). The chapter on Tertullian is by E. de Backer, that on Cyprian and his contemporaries by Father J. B. de Poukens, while the introduction and most of the concluding chapter on the later Anteniceans is by Father J. de Ghellinck with the assistance of Father G. Lebacqz.

Another volume on a third-century personality, who has been much studied of late, is F. Loofs's *Paulus von Samosata; eine Untersuchung zur Altkirchlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte*, appearing in Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen* series (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1924, pp. xx, 346).

Mgr. Pierre Batiffol, who in 1909 published *L'Église Naissante et le Catholicisme* and in 1914 *La Paix Constantinienne*, completes his history of Catholic origins with a volume on *Le Siège Apostolique, 359–451* (Paris, Gabalda, 1924, pp. vii, 624).

Two recent books on early Christian art are Kurt Pfister's *Katakombenmalerei*, the first volume of his series on *Die Kunst des Mittelalters* (Potsdam, Kiepenheuer, 1924, pp. 34, 30 plates), and the posthumous work of Max Dvořák, *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte* (Munich, Pieper, 1924), the first essay of which is likewise devoted to the art of the catacombs.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Hans von Soden, *Die Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche bei Oswald von Spengler* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLIII. 1); Paul Monceaux, *La Vie de Saint Jérôme* (Journal des Savants, July).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

The comprehensive collection of Byzantine documents which the Association Internationale des Académies planned before the Great War will now have to wait a long time for its execution. Meantime a calendar with references will serve many important purposes of the historian. Part I. (565-1025) of *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des Oströmischen Reiches von 565-1453* (Munich and Berlin, R. Oldenbourg, pp. 136), edited by Dr. Franz Dölger, makes a beginning. Four more parts are expected to complete the series of imperial documents. Other series, for the documents of the patriarchate, of civil and ecclesiastical officials, and of private persons, are contemplated. The work has the support of the Munich and Vienna academies.

Social Struggles in the Middle Ages, by Max Beer, translated by H. J. Stenning and revised by the author, appears as vol. II. of Small, Maynard, and Company's *General History of Socialism and Social Struggles*.

Literary Patronage in the Middle Ages (pp. vii, 258), by Karl J. Holzknacht, is a doctoral thesis of the University of Pennsylvania, and is published by the university.

The Archduke Eugene, who commanded the Austrian forces in Tyrol during the war, is engaged in writing a history of the Teutonic Order.

Saint Vincent Ferrer, 1350-1419, the Spanish Dominican, whose activities in Spain, France, and Italy at the time of the Great Schism and the Hundred Years' War make him one of the leading churchmen of his day, forms the subject of a biography by M. M. Gorce (Paris, Plon, 1924, pp. vi, 303). The work is accompanied by a supplement, containing a critical study of the sources, under the title *Les Bases de l'Étude Historique de Saint Vincent Ferrer* (Paris, Plon, 1924, pp. ii, 59).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Ad. von Harnack, *Der erste Deutsche Papst (Bonifatius II., 530-532) und die beiden letzten Dekrete des Römischen Senats* (Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, ph.-hist. Kl., 1924, V.); Fr. von Bezold, *Kaiserin Judith und ihr Dichter Walahfrid Strabo* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXX. 3); P. Richard, *La Monarchie Pontificale jusqu'au Concile de Trente* (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, July-October); Augustin Fliche, *Le Pontificat de Victor III., 1086-1087* (*ibid.*); L. Bréhier, *Une Forteresse de l'Orient Latin; la Cité de Rhodes*, I. (Journal des Savants, July).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Ginn and Company have brought out a revised and enlarged edition of Professor James Harvey Robinson's *Introduction to the History of Modern Europe*, vol. I.

Of highest importance in its field is the publication of the sixth part of the collection of documents relating to the Council of Trent, the fifth part of which appeared in 1919. It bears the title, *Concilium Tridentinum: Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum, Tractatum Nova Collectio ed. Societas Goerresiana*, tomus IX., *Concilii Trid. Actorum pars sexta, complectens Acta post Sessionem 6 (22) usque ad Finem Concilii, 17 Sept. 1562-4 Dec. 1563*, ed. Stephan Ehses (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1924, pp. xxii, 1194).

The intellectual and religious life of the seventeenth century receives further illustration from Erich Seeberg's *Gottfried Arnold, die Wissenschaft und die Mystik seiner Zeit: Studien zur Historiographie und zur Mystik* (Meerane, Herzog, 1923, pp. viii, 611).

At the instance of the Amsterdam Academy of Sciences, the Union Académique Internationale is co-operating in the preparation by the Dutch Historical Commission of a scientific edition of the correspondence of Hugo Grotius. If any reader of this journal knows of the existence in America of any manuscripts of letters written by or to Grotius, it would be a favor if he would mention them to the editor.

In the series *Recueil des Instructions données aux Ambassadeurs et Ministres de France depuis les Traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la Révolution Française*, the third volume devoted to Holland covers the years 1730 to 1788. The introduction and notes are by MM. Louis André and Émile Bourgeois (Paris, Boccard, 1924, pp. 520).

The publisher H. Welter, now of Arnhem in Holland, has been able to resume his great publication, *Conciliorum Collectio Amplissima* (Mansi with continuations) long interrupted by the war. He has issued vol. XLVIII., containing Latin texts from 1860 to 1867, vol. XLIX., *Acta Praesynodalia* of the Vatican Council, and vol. L., beginning the *Acta Synodalia* of the latter. These volumes are sold at \$40.00 apiece. Three more volumes will complete the documents for the Vatican Council, which, if ordered soon, can be separately supplied.

Through Thirty Years, 1892-1922, is the title which Henry Wickham Steed, successively foreign correspondent, foreign editor, and editor of the London *Times*, has given to his reminiscences, which Doubleday, Page, and Company have published. World characters who figure in the author's narrative of experiences range in point of time from Bismarck to Woodrow Wilson.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. S. Hildebrand, *Magellan* (Harper's Magazine, September, October, November); Paul Kalkoff,

Zur Charakteristik Aleanders (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLIII. 1); C. L. Grose, *The Anglo-Dutch Alliance of 1678*, II. (English Historical Review, October); Alfred de Curzon, *Les Français en Angleterre; les Prisonniers de Guerre Français à Liverpool au XVIII^e et au Début du XIX^e Siècle, 1756-1803*, II., concl. (Nouvelle Revue, August 1, 15); Manfred Laubert, *Ungebetene Gäste aus dem Osten, 1842-1847; ein Geschichtlicher Beitrag zur Frage der Osteinwanderung* (Deutsche Rundschau, September); Joachim Kühn, *Après Sedan: Bismarck et Napoléon III.*, concl. (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, September); Conrad Bornhak, *Das Rätsel des Rückversicherungsvertrages* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, June); Ph. Zorn, *Zur Geschichte der Ersten Haager Friedenskonferenz* (*ibid.*, October); A. Mendelssohn Bartholdy, *Der Dreibund in der Europäischen Politik* (*ibid.*, June); E. von Massow, *Kiderlen-Wächter und die Balkanwirren; ein Beitrag zur Vorbereitung des Weltkrieges* (Deutsche Rundschau, October); August Bach, *Die Englisch-Russischen Verhandlungen von 1914 über den Abschluss einer Marinekonvention* (Preussische Jahrbücher, August).

THE WORLD WAR

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace presents a translation (New York, Oxford University Press, pp. xxv, 178) of *The German White Book concerning the Responsibility of the Authors of the War*, as transmitted by the German Commission at Versailles to the Allied and Associated Powers. Notes of Count Brockdorff-Rantzau and observations by his commission are followed by many supplementary documents.

A second and enlarged edition of *Bayerische Dokumente zum Kriegausbruch und zum Versailler Schuldspruch*, ed. Dr. Pius Dirr, has been brought out in Munich by R. Oldenbourg, and makes considerable additions to our knowledge.

The Collapse of Europe, by Karl F. Nowak, with an introduction by Viscount Haldane, treats of the closing months of the Great War, that is, from Brest-Litovsk, in December, 1917, to the collapse in October, 1918. The translation is by Lochner and E. W. Drikes (New York, Dutton).

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has brought out *The Treaties of Peace, 1919-1923*, in two volumes, with maps compiled especially for this edition and a summary of the legal basis of the new boundaries, by Lieut.-Col. Laurence Martin, chief of the Map Division in the Library of Congress.

The War Diary of the Master of Belhaven, 1914-1918 (London, Murray), is a remarkably intelligent account of experiences and observations by an officer of field artillery, eldest son of Lord Belhaven, who was killed in action at the end of March, 1918.

An episode of the World War famous in its time, that of Mr. Henry Ford's "Peace Ship", is recounted by the secretary of the expedition, Louis P. Lochner, in *America's Don Quixote* (London, Kegan Paul).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Fritz Kern, *Sarajewo; die Geburtsstunde des Weltkriegs* (Preussische Jahrbücher, August); Col. B. Schwertfeger, *Französische Gutachter und Schuldfrage* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, August); Emil Daniels, *Asquith, Grey, und der Ursprung des Weltkrieges* (Preussische Jahrbücher, October); Staatsminister von Jagow, *Nochmals die Russische "Verantwortlichkeit"* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, September); Graf Max Montgelas, *Der Nachträgliche Bericht Swerbejew's* (*ibid.*, August); C. L. Hartmann, *Die Russischen Archive und der Kriegsausbruch*, concl. (Deutsche Rundschau, August); Alfred von Wegerer, *Die Dokumente des Konsuls Hartmann* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, August); Général A. Tanant, *Deux Armées Face à Face, Août, 1914* (Revue de Paris, August 15); Commandant L. Koetz, *La Bataille de la Meuse, 1914* (*ibid.*, October 1); Capt. René Andriot, *La Genèse de la Bataille de l'Ourcq* (*ibid.*, September 1); W. Dieckmann, *Arbeiterbewegung und Sozialismus in England, I., Bis zum Ausbruch des Weltkrieges* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, September).

GREAT BRITAIN

General review: Ch. Bémont, *Histoire de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande* (Revue Historique, September).

It is announced that, on representations from Professor Seton-Watson and others, the present Foreign Secretary of Great Britain has agreed that a collection of official documents dealing with the European situation before the war shall be given out by the Foreign Office. Historians will hope that the publication will be as frank as that made by the German government—and that it may have its effect on France and on our own Congress, whose discreditable parsimony (discreditable because so ill apportioned) has prevented the Department of State from issuing any volume of *Foreign Relations* since that for 1915. It is understood that this British official collection will be edited by Dr. George P. Gooch and Mr. H. W. V. Temperley. The Foreign Office has also moved down from 1860 to 1878 the date up to which historians may consult its portion of the national archives at the Public Record Office.

In Professor Shotwell's Carnegie Endowment series on the economic and social history of the World War, a new volume that is shortly to appear is Dr. Hubert Hall's *British Archives and the Sources for the History of the World War*.

Mr. Geoffrey Callender's *The Naval Side of British History* (London, Christophers) offers a general account, mainly devoted to the campaigns of the royal navy, but not neglectful of the general maritime history of England, especially in its earlier period.

Well-managed libraries rapidly outgrow our knowledge of them. There are few who know anything of the library built up in Manchester by the munificence of the late Mrs. John Rylands who will not be astounded by the exhibit of its magnitude, richness, and importance—all a product of less than a generation—which is presented in the handsome volume entitled *The John Rylands Library, Manchester, 1899-1924: a Record of its History, with brief Descriptions of the Building and its Contents*, prepared by the librarian, Dr. Henry Guppy (Manchester, University Press, pp. xviii, 144). There are 62 plates, showing facsimiles of the rarities and views of the beautiful building.

The Yale University Press has in preparation a study of *Council and Curia, 1066-1272*, by Professor George B. Adams; a volume of *Rolls of English Private Courts*, chiefly in the thirteenth century, edited by Professor Warren O. Ault of Boston University, and *A History of the Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations* (Board of Trade, 1748-1782), by Professor Arthur H. Basye of Dartmouth College.

The Pipe Roll Society, which between 1883 and 1915 issued thirty-seven volumes of the Great Rolls of the Exchequer, but was obliged then to discontinue its work, now finds the costs of printing sufficiently reduced to make it possible to contemplate the issue of a yearly volume. It desires therefore to print the unpublished pipe rolls of the reigns of Richard I. and John, and later the one surviving pipe roll of Henry I., but greatly desires to receive additional subscriptions to its membership (at one guinea). They may be sent to the Honorary Secretary, Mrs. Stenton, University College, Reading, England.

The history of the Franciscans in Canterbury, which was the first resting-place of the nine brave friars who introduced the order into England in 1224 and therefore was chosen for the celebration of the seven-hundredth anniversary of their arrival, is treated by Mr. Charles Cotton, librarian of the cathedral, in a volume on *The Grey Friars of Canterbury, 1224 to 1538* (Manchester, British Society of Franciscan Studies, pp. xvi, 112). Much of the book is topographical history, but the history of the friars themselves is also given, so far as it can be recovered.

The Pilgrimage of Robert Langton, treasurer of York Minster from 1509 to 1514 (Harvard University Press), was lately found in a unique copy (London, 1522) in the library of Lincoln Cathedral. Archdeacon E. M. Blackie, canon of that cathedral, has transcribed it, furnished it with an introduction and notes, and printed it in black letter (pp. xxv, 49). The travels are extensive, to Compostella, to Loreto, to Rome, but the observations are almost solely of relics. Canon Blackie also prints, in a similar fashion, from a copy almost unique, *A Most Friendly Farewell to Sir Francis Drake*, by Henry Roberts (*ibid.*).

Messrs. Longmans have published a volume of *Tudor Studies*, presented to Professor A. F. Pollard by the teachers of history in the Uni-

versity of London, colleagues or pupils of Professor Pollard. Among the contributors are Professor R. W. Seton-Watson, editor of the volume, Professors F. J. C. Hearnshaw, A. P. Newton, and Claude Jenkins.

To the standard and scholarly edition of the *Journal* of George Fox (Cambridge, 1911, 2 vols.) a third volume has lately been added by way of commemoration of the tercentenary of his birth. Edited like its predecessors by Dr. Norman Penney, it bears the title, *The Short Journal and Itinerary Journals of George Fox*, and reproduces three manuscripts hitherto unprinted: a narrative written by Fox in Lancaster jail in 1664 of various events from the beginning of his preaching to that time, a full account of his daily journeyings in and around London in his last ten years, and Edward Haistwell's record of movements in 1677 and 1678, partly in Holland. Meanwhile a "tercentenary text" of the *Journal* proper, from Ellwood's clarified text, with an illuminating introduction by Professor Rufus M. Jones, has been published in one volume in *Everyman's Library* (London, Dent; New York, Dutton, pp. 359).

Mrs. Dorothea Townshend adds to her previous biographies a book on *George Digby, Second Earl of Bristol* (London, Fisher Unwin).

Mr. Witt Bowden, of the department of history in the University of Pennsylvania, gives a detailed study and analysis of the change from handicraft to the factory system, and its consequences, in *Industrial Society in England toward the End of the Eighteenth Century*.

The Life of William Cobbett, chiefly by G. D. H. Cole, but for which a portion had been written by the late F. E. Green, has been published this autumn (London, Collins).

Messrs. Fisher Unwin have brought out the first volume of a translation of M. Élie Halévy's *History of the English People* (1815).

Professor Charles K. Webster, of the University of Wales, has for several years been occupied with the study of Castlereagh; the results are now presented in a substantial volume on *The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, 1815-1822* (London, Bell).

Messrs. Duckworth of London are about to publish a volume of *Letters of the King of Hanover*, written to Lord Strangford by the Duke of Cumberland, afterwards King Ernest I.

Messrs. Blackwood announce *Lord John Manners and his Friends*, in two volumes, by Charles Whibley.

The Triumph of Lord Palmerston: a Study of Public Opinion in England before the Crimean War, by B. Kingsley Martin, comes from the Dial Press.

The Life of Lord Wolseley, based on his own papers and official documents hitherto unpublished, and written by Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice and Sir George Arthur, was published by Messrs. Heinemann in November.

The *Diary of Lord Bertie of Thame, 1914-1918* (Hodder and Stoughton, 2 vols.), edited by Lady Algernon Gordon-Lennox, though informal and plainly not intended for publication, is of much importance because of its author's position as British ambassador in Paris during the years named and earlier, and because of the high qualities of the man; these are set forth in an appreciation by Viscount Grey of Fallodon.

The *Scottish Historical Review* for October has articles on the Judicial Committees of the Scottish Parliament, by Sir Philip J. Hamilton-Grierson; on the Cleansing of I-colum-cille (destruction of monuments at Iona by the Synod of Argyll), by J. R. N. McPhail; on Papal Bulls found among the Hamilton Papers, by Professor R. K. Hannay; on the Norsemen in the Hebrides, by Canon R. C. MacLeod; and on Sixteenth-Century Schemes for the Plantation of Ulster (first article), by Robert Dunlop.

Major-Gen. R. H. Mahon, whose small book on *The Indictment of Mary Queen of Scots* has been mentioned before in these pages, now presents in another small volume, *Mary Queen of Scots, a Study of the Lennox Narrative in the University Library at Cambridge* (Cambridge University Press, pp. viii, 148), an independent solution of the problem of the Casket Letters.

British government publications: *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, Edward VI., I. and II., 1547-1549.

Other documentary publications: *Lincolnshire Domesday and the Lindsey Survey*, trans. and ed. by Canons C. W. Foster and T. Longley (Lincoln Record Society).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. H. Hodgkin, *The Beginning of the Year in the English Chronicle* (English Historical Review, October); May McKisack, *Borough Representation in Richard II.'s Reign* (*ibid.*); W. S. Holdsworth, *Defamation in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Law Quarterly Review, July); B. M. H. Rogers, *Dampier's Voyage of 1703* (Mariner's Mirror, October); W. G. H. Cook, *Electoral Reform and Organized Christianity in England*, I., II. (Political Science Quarterly, September, December); J. H. Park, *The English Workingmen and the American Civil War* (*ibid.*, September).

IRELAND AND THE DOMINIONS

(For Canada, see p. 448; for India, see p. 432.)

The Union of South Africa and the Great War, 1914-1918 (Pretoria, Government Printing Office, pp. 230), is the official history, briefly but competently setting forth the story of South African effort in the campaigns in German Southwest Africa and German East Africa especially, but also the work of South African contingents in France and Egypt.

The third volume of *The Empire at War*, which Sir Charles Lucas is editing for the Royal Colonial Institute, was published by the Oxford

University Press in November. It contains the sections dealing with the parts played in the war by Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific islands. The fourth and fifth (last) volumes, dealing with Africa, the East, and the Mediterranean, will follow shortly.

The fourth and concluding volume of the official history of New Zealand's share in the Great War is entitled *The War Effort of New Zealand* (Auckland, Whitcombe and Tombs), and gives a popular account of the minor campaigns in which New Zealanders took part, of the work at the bases, naval and military, and of other matters not embraced in the preceding volumes.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Abbot Aloysius Smith, *The Lateran Canons and Ireland* (Dublin Review, October); Paul Knaplund, *The Unification of South Africa: a Study in British Colonial Policy* (Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, XXI.).

FRANCE

General reviews: L. Halphen, *Histoire de France: le Moyen Age jusqu'aux Valois* (Revue Historique, November-December); H. Omont, *Nouvelles Acquisitions du Département des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale pendant les Années 1921-1923* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, January-June, 1924).

The third and fourth fascicles of the *Annuaire-Bulletin* of the Société de l'Histoire de France for 1923 (Paris, Champion) contain the text of sixty-eight *Lettres de Charles VII. relatives à la Provence*, taken by Henri Stein from the departmental archives of Bouches-du-Rhône; also a *Journal Inédit du Parlement de Paris Exilé à Pontoise, 21 Juillet-17 Décembre, 1720*, edited by Léon Lecestre. Reference may also be made at this point to a volume on *La Provence au Moyen Age, 1112-1481*, by V. L. Bourrilly and Raoul Busquet (Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. 464).

Jacques Bainville's *Histoire de France* (Paris, Fayard, 1924, pp. 573) is a cleverly written interpretation of French history from the royalist point of view.

An important new addition to the *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France: Départements* is vol. XLVII., for Strasbourg, prepared by Ernest Wickersheimer (Paris, Plon, 1924, pp. xii, 936).

The best brief introduction to French numismatics will be found in a little volume on *Les Monnaies Françaises* from the time of the Gauls to the present (Paris, Payot, 1923, pp. 133) by Adolphe Dieudonné, the successor of the late Ernest Babelon as director of the Cabinet des Médailles.

Under the title *Recueil des Historiens de la France publié par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres: Pouillés*, tome VIII. *Pouillés des Provinces d'Aix, d'Arles, et d'Embrun*, edited under the direction of

Maurice Prou by Étienne Clouzot (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1923, pp. clxiii, 556), the work which Longnon began and finished for the provinces of Tours, Rouen, Lyons, Sens, and Reims, is carried a stage further toward completion on a scale entirely worthy of the series of which it forms a part.

Le Domaine de l'Abbaye de Cluny aux X^e et XI^e Siècles, by G. de Valous (Paris, Champion, 1923, pp. 190), is an important contribution to the economic history of Cluny.

The best edition of the documents relating to the suppression of the Templars is Georges Lizerand's *Le Dossier de l'Affaire des Templiers édité et traduit*, being the second fascicle of Louis Halphen's *Collection des Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Age* (Paris, Champion, 1923, pp. xxiv, 229).

The admirable *Histoire Poétique du Quinzième Siècle* (Paris, Champion, 1923, 2 vols., pp. xi, 395, 471) by Pierre Champion, well known for his studies of Villon and Charles d'Orléans, is not a history of literature so much as a reconstruction of the century's social and intellectual life through selections from the work of its most representative poets.

Émile Picot and (since the former's death) Henri Stein have produced for the Société des Bibliophiles Français a handsome quarto *Recueil de Pièces Historiques Imprimées sous le Règne de Louis XI.*, reproduced in facsimile with historical and bibliographic commentaries (Paris, Lefrançois, 1923, pp. viii, 370; pp. 310 of facsimiles).

The lighter side of court life under the Old Régime is depicted in two recent volumes by writers with historic names: *La Mère du Grand Condé*, by the Vicomte de Noailles (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1924, pp. vi, 406) and *Autour d'un Ministre de Louis XV.; Lettres Intimes Inédites*, by the Marquis d'Argenson (Paris, Messein, 1923, pp. 304). A solid study is *La Femme et le Féminisme avant la Révolution*, by Léon Abensour (Paris, Leroux, 1923, pp. xxii, 479).

The Louisville Free Public Library owns a bound manuscript of about 425 octavo pages in French in an eighteenth or nineteenth century hand. If it is the original and not a copy of the original, it was probably written in 1796 by a royalist sympathizer. It is entitled *Événements qui ont préparé la Destruction du Trône en France*. It was probably brought to this country by Col. Reuben T. Durrett, as it formerly belonged to the Kentucky Polytechnic Society of which he was president. Any information regarding it, particularly as to how it came to this country, whether such a manuscript has ever been published in whole or in part or quoted anywhere, whether there is any other copy of it in existence, and any indication as to who the author might be would be greatly appreciated by Mr. Louis R. Gottschalk of the University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.

Gaston Martin discusses *Carrier et sa Mission à Nantes* in a book published at Paris by Les Presses Universitaires (1924, pp. 394).

Les Paysans du Nord pendant la Révolution Française, by Georges Lefebvre (Paris, Rieder, 1924, 2 vols., pp. xxv, 1020), a thesis for the doctorat ès lettres, is said to be the best monograph which has yet appeared on the economic history of the peasants during the Revolution.

Vol. III. of the *Histoire de Lorraine* by Robert Parisot, professor in the University of Nancy, covers the period from 1789 to 1919 (Paris, Picard, 1924, pp. viii, 521).

Joseph Turquan, who in his *Les Princesses Elisa et Pauline* had already produced the first volume of a series on *Les Sœurs de Napoléon*, now adds a second, devoted to *La Princesse Caroline Murat* (Paris, Talandier, 1924, pp. 320).

The fourth volume of *La Société du Second Empire* by Comte Fleury and Louis Sonolet covers the years from 1867 to 1870 (Paris, Michel, 1924, pp. 538).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Lemonnier, *Paris au Moyen Age* (Journal des Savants, July); L. Levillain, *L'Archichapelain Ebroin, Evêque de Poitiers* (Le Moyen Age, September–December, 1923); Ferdinand Lot, *Les Tributs aux Normands et l'Eglise de France au IX^e Siècle* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, January–June, 1924); Willi Schwarz, *Der Investiturstreit in Frankreich*, concl. (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLIII. 1); Ch. Petit-Dutaillis, *Le Déshéritement de Jean sans Terre et le Meurtre d'Arthur de Bretagne*, I. (Revue Historique, November); R. Planchenault, *De l'Utilité pour l'Histoire de France de quelques Chroniques Anglaises de la Première Moitié du XV^e Siècle* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, January–June, 1924); A. Chuquet, *L'Assassin d'Henri III.* (Revue de Paris, September 1); G. Fagniez, *L'Assistance Publique et la Charité Féminine dans la Première Moitié du XVII^e Siècle*, II. (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); G. de la Rochefoucauld, *Un Homme d'Eglise et d'Etat au Commencement du XVII^e Siècle* [Cardinal François de la Rochefoucauld], concl. (Revue de Paris, August 1); Henri Sée, *La Doctrine Politique et Sociale de Turgot* (Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française, September); *id.*, *Les Forêts et la Question du Déboisement en Bretagne à la Fin de l'Ancien Régime*, I. (Annales de Bretagne, XXXVI. 1); F. Charles-Roux, *Bonaparte et l'Indigène d'Égypte* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, November); Comte de Sérignan, *Le Général Malet et le Coup de Force du 23 Octobre, 1812*, III. (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); Lord Kerry, *Le Comte de Flahault et le Coup d'État de 1851* (Revue de Paris, September 15); P. Imbart de la Tour, *L'Oeuvre Historique de M. Hanotaux* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 1).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

Rafael Sabatini's *Cesare Borgia* is followed soon by *The Life and Times of Rodrigo Borgia* (London, Stanley Paul), by Mr. Arnold H. Mathews.

Joseph Schnitzer's *Savonarola* (Munich, Reinhardt, 1924, 2 vols., pp. xii, 1167), the fruit of twenty-five years of special study, is at once the most recent and the most authoritative life of the great Florentine reformer.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Gen. Eugenio Barbarich, *La Carsia Giulia nella Geografia, nella Storia, e nell' Arte Militare* (Nuova Antologia, September 16); Ivan Pusino, *Ein Neues Dokument zur Geschichte Savonarolas* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLIII. 1); V. Scholderer, *Printing in Venice to the End of 1481* (The Library, September); Luigi Emery, *Religione e Politica nella Mente di Fra Paolo Sarpi*, I. (Nuova Rivista Storica, May); Guido Porzio, *Il Diario Eroico di Francesco Crispi* (*ibid.*); Angela Valente, *Un Dramma Politico alla Corte di Filippo II.*; *Antonio Perez e la Principessa d'Eboli*, I. (*ibid.*); André Fugier, *Un Financier Diplomate: José Martinez de Hervas, Chargé d'Affaires d'Espagne à Paris, 1803-1804* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, September).

GERMANY, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

General reviews: G. Allemang, *Courrier Allemand* [books in German, 1921-1923, on German and Austrian history] (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); Emil Daniels, *Historische Literatur* [certain German monographs, 1922-1923, on German modern historical subjects] (Preussische Jahrbücher, July).

In *Die Deutsche Stadt: ein Beitrag zur Morphologie der Kulturlandschaft* (Stuttgart, J. Engelhorns Nachf., 1924, pp. 194), Walter Geisler presents a useful study in historical geography.

In *Die Kaiser- und Königskrönungen zu Aachen, 815-1531* (Rheinische Neujahrsblätter, fasc. 3, Bonn, Schröder, 1924, pp. 102) Aloys Schulte gives a variety of interesting details regarding the coronations at Aix-la-Chapelle.

Adolf Waas's *Vogtei und Bede in der Deutschen Kaiserzeit*, II. Teil (Berlin, Weidmann, 1923, pp. 151) is a useful discussion of certain ecclesiastical administrative institutions in the Middle Ages.

One of the best edited collections of sixteenth-century correspondence is *Konrad Peutingers Briefwechsel* (Munich, Beck, 1923, pp. xv, 527), the first volume of *Humanistenbriefe*, in course of publication by the Kommission für Erforschung der Geschichte der Reformation und Gegenreformation. The work of editing was done by Erich König under the general direction of the late Hermann von Grauert.

Documents covering the Peasants' Revolt during the month from Mar. 3 to Apr. 4, 1525, have been published under the title *Akten zur Geschichte des Bauernkriegs in Mitteldeutschland*, I. (Sächs. Komm. für Geschichte, 1923). The editor, O. Merx, died before the publication of the volume, which was to be continued for the subsequent period.

In a previous number (XXIX. 197) mention has been made of the remarkable publication in Germany of the correspondence of the Fugger family. An English translation of *Fugger News-Letters, 1568-1605*, selected from the correspondence of that historic house, has been published (London, John Lane; New York, Putnam), with an introduction by H. Gordon Selfridge.

Fritz Wuessing's *Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes vom Ausgang des Achtzehnten Jahrhunderts bis zur Gegenwart: ein Sozialpsychologischer Versuch* (second ed., Berlin, Schneider, 1923) is an excellent representative of the Lamprecht school, written from a democratic, anti-militarist standpoint.

What is said to be the first thorough discussion of the origin of the German army laws of 1911-1913, based on unpublished sources, is presented by Hans Herzfeld under the title *Die Deutsche Rüstungspolitik vor dem Weltkrieg* (Bonn, Schroeder, 1923, pp. 162).

A valuable fruit of the Czechoslovak Institute in Rome is an additional volume of *Acta Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide res gestas Bohemicas illustrantia, 1622-1623*, ed. Ignace Kollmann (Prague, 1923, pp. 475).

A valuable document for better knowledge of the Anabaptists is the *Geschicht-Buch der Hutterischen Brüder*, a Baptist sect of Austria (Vienna, Fromme, 1923, pp. xli, 697). The original (a chronicle of community life from 1542 to 1665) was lost, but has been restored by Rudolf Wolkan from copies in the hands of members of the sect who migrated to Canada in 1874.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Erich Heinze, *Das Kursächsische Reichsvikariatsrecht vor der Goldenen Bulle* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXII. 1); Éd. Rott, *Le Secret de l'Empereur, 1692-1694* (Revue Historique, September); Georges Grosjean, *La Diplomatie Rhénane de Vergennes* (Revue de Paris, October 15); Hans Drüner, *Der Nationale und der Universale Gedanke bei dem Freiherrn vom Stein* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXII. 1); Wilhelm Stolze, *Zur Geschichte der Reichsgründung im Jahre 1870* (Preussische Jahrbücher, July); Gerhard Ritter, *Bismarcks Verhältnis zu England und die Politik des "Neuen Kurses"* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, June); Felix Rachfahl, *Die Deutsche Aussenpolitik der Wilhelminischen Ära*, concl. (*ibid.*, August); A. O. Meyer, *Fürst Hohenlohe und die Krügerdepesche* (*ibid.*, June); Karl Demeter, *Der Geist der Deutschen Sozialpolitik vor dem Kriege* (Preussische Jahrbücher, October); Lieut.-Col. Schweisguth, *L'Administration Militaire des Pays Rhénans*, I., concl. (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 1, 15); F. Thimme, *Die Aktenpublikation des Auswärtigen Amtes und ihre Gegner* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, June); Comte de Sainte-Aulaire, *Souvenirs de mon Ambassade à Vienne*, IV. (Revue de Paris, October 15).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

Dr. P. Geyl, professor of Dutch history and literature in the University of London, casts light on a dim and humdrum period of Dutch history by his *Willem IV. en Engeland tot 1748* (the Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, pp. xvi, 358), showing mainly the effect of English relations on the internal politics of the Netherlands.

The Belgian Commission Royale d'Histoire has now printed the fourth, and concluding volume, of its *Recueil de Documents relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Industrie Drapière en Flandre*, ed. Espinas and Pirenne, finishing the series, supplying a chronological table of documents, and a full index to the four volumes.

La Principauté et le Diocèse de Liège sous Robert de Berghes, 1557-1584, by Camille Tihon, archivist in the Belgian Archives Générales (Liège, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fasc. 31, 1923, pp. 330), is of capital importance for the history of that principality in the late sixteenth century.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Maj. Georges Van Egroo, *Les Belges à Waterloo* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, November).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

General review: M. Hein, on books of Swedish history published since 1921 (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXX. 3).

It is expected that this winter a Scandinavian Institute will be added to the scholarly establishments of that type in Rome, to exploit the archives and library of the Vatican for the benefit of the history of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway.

The *Historisk Tidsskrift* of the Norwegian Historical Society, fifth ser., V. 7, is occupied with a bibliography of writings on Norwegian history, 1920-1922, by Leiv Amundsen, numbering more than 2500 entries. In VI. 1 Professor Halvdan Koht discusses the documentary sources or chancery records on which the saga of King Håkon Håkons-son and the Icelandic Annals must have been based. G. Tank gives the history of sales and leases of crown lands from 1814 to 1848. In VI. 2, Jørgen Scheel relates the history of Markus Gerhard Rosencrone, Norwegian, foreign minister of Denmark 1780-1784, and Professor Edvard Bull that of the *stevne*, or peasant assemblies for local self-government in the Middle Ages. Professor Koht and Professor Finnur Jónsson carry on in both numbers a controversy as to the chronology of the early kings of Norway. The *Tidsskrift* has now adopted the practice of printing, after each of its major articles, a summary in English; the smaller contributions, though often interesting (Magnus Barfot and Walter Giffard, Archdeacon Thomas Agnellus of Wells, the Comet of 1240), have not this accompaniment.

As vol. XV. of the annual *Islandica* (Ithaca, Cornell University Library, pp. xxviii, 40), Mr. Halldór Hermannsson, curator of the Fiske Icelandic Collection, presents a learned little monograph on Jón Guðmundsson (1574-1658), peasant naturalist, wanderer, dabbler in magic, and prints for the first time, in Icelandic, his discourse on the Natural History of Iceland, the first such treatise except that which Bishop Gísli Oddsson, a few years before, wrote in Latin (*Islandica*, X.). Mr. Hermannsson reproduces, in nine plates, the drawings which illustrate the treatise. The most important section is that on the whales and similar creatures.

German historiography has lacked a scholarly, modern history of Poland, which is now supplied by Erdmann Hanisch's *Geschichte Polens* (Bonn, Schroeder, 1923, pp. 389).

Professor Sergei Platonov's *History of Russia*, long in standard use in the Russian universities, has been brought up to 1923 and revised by its author, translated by Mr. Emanuel Aronsberg, under the editorship of Professor F. A. Golder of Stanford University, and published by the Macmillan Company.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Jacques Fouques-Duparc, *Les Barons Baltes* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXVIII. 3); B. Maklakoff, *La Russie de 1900 à 1917* (Revue de Paris, October 1); Manfredi Gravina, *L'Eredità di Lenin* (Nuova Antologia, August 16); Boris Brutzkus, *Die Russische Agrarrevolution* (Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft, LXXVIII. 2).

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

S. Th. Lascaris, secretary in the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs, publishes, with documents, *La Politique Extérieure de la Grèce avant et après le Congrès de Berlin, 1875-1881* (Paris, Bossard, 1924, pp. 222).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Walter Anderssen, *Die Entwicklung der Ungarischen Räteverfassung* (Ungarische Jahrbücher, June); Paul Arras, *Regestenbeiträge zur Geschichte des Matthias I. Corvinus* (*ibid.*); Pierre David, *Un Consulat de France en Bosnie sous le Premier Empire*, concl. (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXVIII. 3); Em. Panaitescu, *La Frontiera Orientale della Latinità: la Romania e la Bessarabia* (Nuova Antologia, September 16); Michel Lhéritier, *Le Traité d'Alliance Secret entre la Grèce et la Serbie, 1867-1868* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, September).

ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

In the *Journal of Indian History* for March Dr. George Edmundson gives a general account of the viceroy Affonso de Albuquerque, Professor Jadunath Sarkar an article on the History of the Madras Coast from 1680 to 1690, and Mr. Francis H. Skrine an article on Anglo-Russian

Rivalry in the East; but the longest article, and one of much value, is that of Mr. P. E. Roberts on Warren Hastings and his Accusers.

The Madras Government Press has issued vol. IX. (pp. xxx, 443) of Mr. Dodwell's translation of *The Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Adm. G. A. Ballard, *The First Plan of European Dominion in the Indian Ocean* (Mariner's Mirror, October).

AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

A very timely interest attaches to the two lectures on *Recent Constitutional Developments in Egypt* (Cambridge University Press), by the late Sir William Hayter, who for some years was legal adviser to the Egyptian government. They were delivered at Cambridge last August. They are immensely informing and valuable.

Vol. II. of the first series of the *Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de l'Algérie* is an edition of the *Correspondance du Général Voirol, Commandant par intérim le Corps d'Occupation d'Afrique, 1833-1834* (Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. xiv, 825), by Gabriel Esquer, whose book on the *Prise d'Alger* has been mentioned in this journal.

One of the important operations in the dealings of France with Morocco finds definitive treatment in *L'Expédition de Fez*, by Col. Paul Azan, with an introduction by Marshal Lyautey (Paris, Berger-Levrault, pp. 352).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington has nearly completed the preparation for the press of the *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, edited by Professor Bassett, estimated to comprise six volumes. Mr. Matteson's *List of Manuscripts concerning American History preserved in European Libraries and noted in their Catalogues and Similar Printed Lists* is in page-proof, its index is completed, and the volume will soon be published. It will furnish descriptions of some 2000 manuscripts of which it is safe to say that nearly all are unknown to American investigators. At the end of the year Mr. David W. Parker had nearly finished his tour of the Lesser Antilles, examining their archives for description in a future volume. Mr. Gunnar J. Malmin's notes upon the materials in Scandinavian archives respecting immigration to America and on the American materials in the Foreign Office at Copenhagen will, as soon as possible, be combined with similar notes from the archives of the Swedish Foreign Office made by Mr. Erik Naumann, archivist there, and with the notes of Professor Amandus Johnson on Swedish manuscripts relating to New Sweden, and those of Professor Waldemar Westergaard on Danish materials for the history of the Danish West Indies, to make a *Guide to Manuscript Materials for American History in Scandinavian Archives*.

Among recent accessions of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress are to be noted: 20 letters, and photostat copies of some others, from Grover Cleveland to John G. Carlisle, 1885-1905; papers of John Russell Young, embracing about 2000 letters relating to political and newspaper history, 1858-1898; 50 photostat copies, provided by Mr. James B. Wilbur, of original Washington letters possessed by the New Hampshire Historical Society; 9 letters of Albert Gallatin to Caesar Rodney, 1805-1811; and a photostat copy from the British Museum of William Byrd's journal of the commission to establish the boundary between Virginia and North Carolina, 1728. The Library, which in 1918 published a *Check List of Collections of Personal Papers in Historical Societies, Libraries, etc.*, has now brought out a new and much enlarged edition, noting papers of more than 2500 individuals, *Manuscripts in Public and Private Collections in the United States* (Superintendent of Documents, pp. 87, 50 cents).

The Yale University Press has in preparation a study of *The Old Plantation System of the British West Indies*, by Professor Frank W. Pitman; a volume of *Reports of Cases in the Vice-Admiralty of the Province of New York and in the Court of Admiralty of the State, 1715-1788*, edited by the Hon. Charles M. Hough, U. S. circuit judge; a volume on *Jacksonian Democracy in Massachusetts, 1824-1848*, by Dr. A. B. Darling; and one on *Vermont and Great Britain, 1779-1783*, by Professor Clarence W. Rife of Hamline University.

Teachers interested in the project method of presenting the facts and some of the history of American government will find useful Milton Conover's *Working Manual of Original Sources in American Government* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1924, pp. vii, 135), which contains numerous problems, assignments, and references bearing upon the national, state, municipal, and local units. The exercises have the advantage of having been successfully used by the author at the University of Pennsylvania and at New York University.

The firm of Harcourt has brought out *The Evolution of American Political Parties: a Sketch of Party Development*, by Professor Edgar E. Robinson, of Stanford University.

Professor James A. Woodburn has brought out a third, revised and enlarged, edition of his *Political Parties and Party Problems in the United States* (Putnam).

Professor Randolph G. Adams of the University of Michigan, custodian of the William L. Clements Library, has published this autumn, chiefly for college purposes, *A History of the Foreign Policy of the United States* (Macmillan).

The History of Religion in the United States (Macmillan), by Professor Henry K. Rowe of the Newton Theological Institution, is an excellent attempt, by a competent authority, to give in brief form an ac-

count of religious development among both laity and clergy and to show the part played by religion in the making of the nation. *A History of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ*, by Augustus W. Drury, has been issued in Dayton, Ohio, by the Otterbein Press. *A History of Religious Education in the Episcopal Church to 1835*, by Clifton H. Brewer, appears in the series of *Yale Studies in the History and Theory of Religious Education*. The Yale University Press also publishes *A History of Religious Education in Connecticut to the Middle of the Nineteenth Century*, by George Stewart, jr.

The Macmillan Company has published *A History of the Public Land Policies of the United States* by Professor Benjamin H. Hibbard of the University of Wisconsin, a volume in a series called the *Land Economics Series*, edited by Professor Richard T. Ely, but originally planned as part of the series of volumes of American economic history projected by the Department of Economics in the Carnegie Institution of Washington.

On Nov. 10 the Metropolitan Museum at New York opened a fine group of "period rooms" comprised in its new American wing, presenting a beautiful and instructive exhibition of one division of American art.

Seneca Myths and Folk Tales, by Arthur C. Parker, archaeologist of the New York State Museum, has been published by the Buffalo Historical Society as vol. XXVII. of the society's *Publications*. The author, himself of the Seneca nation, records that "his earliest recollections are of hearing the wise old men relate these tales of the mysterious past". In later years he returned and spent months among the Senecas, recording their folk tales, songs, rituals, customs, etc. Mr. Parker explains, by way of introduction, the basic premises of Seneca folk-lore, the characteristic, even stereotyped, themes about which the tales are woven, the materials of which they are composed, and, in an interesting description of life in a Seneca long-house, portrays the atmosphere in which the legends were told. There are 72 tales recorded in the volume, followed by an appendix in which a number of topics, such as the origin of the world, the Wyandot creation myth, and emblematic trees, are specially treated by himself and others.

Harper and Brothers have brought out a volume by John T. Faris, entitled *The Romance of Forgotten Towns*, in which are gathered 42 stories of American towns that were and are not, from Pemaquid and Jamestown to Nauvoo and Wailatpu.

Among the announcements of the Librairie Plon is *Une Amitié Historique; France-Amérique*, by Mme. Tryphosa Bates-Batcheller, with a preface by M. Gabriel Hanotaux (Paris, 1924, pp. 240, 28).

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

A paper entitled *Precolumbian Discovery by Basques*, by Louis D. Scisco, appears as a separate from the *Transactions* of the Royal Society of Canada, vol. XVIII.

Professor Frederic L. Paxson's *History of the American Frontier, 1763-1893*, has come from the press (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company).

Mr. John C. Fitzpatrick has gathered into a volume, to which he has given the title *The Spirit of the Revolution: New Light from some of the Original Sources of American History*, a number of interesting articles which appeared originally in the *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine*.

Smith College Studies in History, IX. 3 and 4, is a monograph by Professor J. Fred Rippey and Miss Angie Debo, on *The Historical Background of the American Policy of Isolation*, dealing fully and carefully with that subject for the period from 1775 to the Neutrality Proclamation of 1793.

The Journal of Nicholas Cresswell, 1774-1777, is the diary of a young Englishman in America during the early years of the Revolution (New York, Dial Press).

In the series of historical volumes published under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus a recent issue is *The American States during the Revolution, 1775-1789*, by Allan Nevins, treating of the transition in matters of constitution, politics, finance, and culture, in the individual states.

The Houghton Mifflin Company are publishing, in a small and handsome edition, *Letters from America, 1776-1779*, being letters of Brunswick, Hessian, and Waldeck officers who were with the British army during the Revolutionary War, translated by Dr. R. W. Pettengill.

The Rhode Island Historical Society has brought out *The Memoranda of William Green, Secretary to Vice-Admiral Arbuthnot in the American Revolution*, edited, with introduction and notes, by Henry S. Fraser of Cornell University. The memoranda here printed relate principally to those naval events of the Revolution which came within Green's cognizance during his service with Arbuthnot (1779-1781), but in part also to some subsequent commercial ventures. Mr. Fraser's editing of the document is scholarly and efficient.

The King's Mountain Men: the Story of the Battle, with Sketches of the American Soldiers who took Part, by Kathrine K. White, is published in Dayton, Va., by the Joseph K. Ruebush Company.

Genesis and Birth of the Federal Constitution is the title given to a group of addresses and papers in the Marshall-Wythe School of Government and Citizenship of the College of William and Mary. The volume

was prepared under the editorial charge of Dr. J. A. C. Chandler, president of the college (Macmillan).

The Supreme Court and Sovereign States is the collective title given to the volume of Stafford Little Lectures of Mr. Charles Warren, assistant attorney general of the United States from 1914 to 1918 (Princeton University Press).

The History of the United States Post Office to the Year 1829, by Wesley E. Rich, is included among the *Harvard Economic Studies*.

As its contribution to the centenary of the Monroe Doctrine, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has published (New York, Oxford University Press, pp. ix, 573) the *Monroe Doctrine: its Importance in the International Life of the States of the New World*, by the Chilean publicist Dr. Alejandro Alvarez. The volume is a useful survey of the entire subject, containing chapters with annexed documents on the historical and comparative exposition of the ideas of the United States and of Latin America with regard to the doctrine, on its principles, on the attitude of Europe toward it and the principal cases of its application, and giving also a valuable digest of declarations and opinions by Latin American and North American statesmen and publicists regarding the pronouncement.

William O. Scroggs, contributor to the financial columns of the New York *Evening Post*, has brought out through the firm of Doubleday *A Century of Banking Progress*.

America of the Fifties: Letters of Frederika Bremer (*Scandinavian Classics*, vol. XXIII.), edited by Adolph B. Benson, has been published by the American-Scandinavian Foundation.

Recollections and Letters of General Robert E. Lee, by his son, Capt. R. E. Lee, with an introduction by Gamaliel Bradford, contains previously unpublished material gathered by Dr. William T. Thom (Doubleday).

Vol. II. of Professor David S. Muzzey's *United States of America* has come from the press (Boston, Ginn). The subtitle of the volume is *From the Civil War*; the story is brought to the spring of 1924.

The Aftermath of the Civil War: based on Investigation of War Claims, by Wiley Britton, has been brought out in Kansas City, Mo., by the Smith-Grievies Company.

Recent American History (Macmillan), by Professor Lester B. Shippee of the University of Minnesota, is a text-book for college use, combining economic, social, and political history.

Forty Years in Newspaperdom, by Milton A. McRae, president of the Scripps-McRae syndicate, is from the press of Brentano.

Doubleday, Page, and Company have brought out *The Letters of Archie Butt, Personal Aide to President Roosevelt*, edited, with a bio-

graphical sketch of the writer, by Lawrence F. Abbott; the house of Scribner, a volume of *Letters from Theodore Roosevelt to Anna Roosevelt Cowles, 1870-1918*.

Harper and Brothers have brought out a biography of the late John Wanamaker by Dr. Russell H. Conwell. The title of the volume is *The Romantic Rise of a Great American*. Meanwhile a life of his partner, Robert Ogden, prominent among the founders of Hampton and Tuskegee institutes, by P. Whitwell Wilson, has been published by Doubleday, Page, and Company.

Vol. CXIII., no. 1 of *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*, is a study of the *Humane Movement in the United States, 1910-1922*, by Dr. William J. Shultz (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1924, pp. 319), which continues Professor Roswell C. McCrea's descriptive survey of the same field, and gives for the period a useful account of the development, organization, and work of the several agencies concerned with animal and child protection. In the appendixes are summaries of state laws on these subjects, recommendations of the American Humane Society, the Illinois education law of 1909, and a chart showing the organization of humane activities in Wisconsin.

The Legal Research Committee of the Commonwealth Fund has issued *The Federal Trade Commission: a Study in Administrative Law and Procedure*, by Gerard C. Henderson (Yale University Press, 1924, pp. xiii, 382). The investigation is limited to that part of the commission's work which is concerned with its normal and permanent duties, namely, the administering of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and sections 2, 3, 7, and 8 of the Clayton Act. The author concludes that the commission would be made more effective through modification of the present procedure in which that body is both complainant and judge, through the substitution of narrative and descriptive reports for the present formal findings, and in a more careful selection of cases. There are appended the acts from which the commission derives its powers and, in addition to the general index, an index of cases.

The Messages and Papers of Woodrow Wilson, with editorial notes and an introduction by Albert Shaw, is brought out by the *Review of Reviews* Corporation.

Woodrow Wilson: the Man, his Times, and his Task, is from the pen of William Allen White and the press of the Houghton Mifflin Company.

Joseph M. Chapple is the author of a *Life and Times of Warren G. Harding, our After-War President* (Boston, Chapple Publishing Company).

LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

Supported by 180 citations from eighty books, Deane Phillips's *Horse Raising in Colonial New England* (Memoir 54 of Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station) traces through 55 pages the source and increase of New England horses, the effects of free range upon them, the beginnings and growth of commercial horse-raising for the West Indian trade, and its decline after the Revolution—an intelligent account of a phase of colonial economic history which proves to be of more significance and susceptible of fuller treatment than might, at first blush, have appeared probable.

The Marine Research Society of Salem publishes a second illustrated volume on *The Sailing Ships of New England*, by John Robinson and George Francis Dow; and a new and illustrated edition of Captain Edmund Fanning's *Voyages and Discoveries in the South Seas, 1792-1832*.

John F. Sprague and Bertram E. Packard are the joint authors of a volume entitled *Three Men from Maine: Sir William Pepperrell, Sir William Phips, James Sullivan; and a Bit of Old England in New England* (Dover-Foxcroft, Maine, Sprague's *Journal of Maine History*).

The July number of the *Mayflower Descendant* prints both text and facsimile of a letter from Edward Winslow to Governor Winthrop, dated "the 5th of the 4. Mo. 1636", with an introduction by the editor; also a continuation of *Good Newes from New England*.

In the *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, October number, the papers on Salem Vessels and their Voyages, and Blockade Running during the Civil War, by G. G. Putnam and F. B. C. Bradlee, respectively, are continued.

The History of Salem, Massachusetts, by Sidney Perley, has been published in Salem by the author.

The *Rhode Island Historical Society Collections* for October has for its main contents an illustrated paper on Indian Implements found in Rhode Island, written by the librarian, Howard M. Chapin.

The Evolution of an old New England Church: being the History of the Old Stone Church in East Haven, Connecticut, by Harry K. Eversuel, is published in East Haven by the author.

The John Carter Brown Library has carried to the end of 1779 its photostat reproductions, for subscribers, of the *Newport Mercury*.

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The July number of the *Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association* contains a study, by R. M. Naylor, of the Royal Prerogative in New York, 1691-1775, and an article by A. C. Parker en-

titled Unhistorical Museums or Museums of History—Which? The contents of the October number include an account of Colonel Henry T. Van Rensselaer, by Mary L. D. Ferris; a sketch of Philip Livingston, by Robert W. Anthony; an article entitled the High Dutch and the Low Dutch in New York, by Charles Maar; and the Teaching of French in Colonial New York City, by R. F. Seybolt.

The *New York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin* for October includes some account of the action of the society on the occasion of Lafayette's visit to America in 1824, and a letter from Mary Stockton Hunter to her sister, Susan Stockton Cuthbert, dated at Washington City, Aug. 30, 1814, describing the capture and burning of Washington by the British.

The firm of Lippincott has brought out a volume by Harold D. Eberlein entitled *The Manors and Historic Homes of the Hudson Valley*.

The Buffalo Historical Society has in press a history of the Holland Land Company, by Dr. Paul D. Evans of Yale University. It has been written from documents and official records in part preserved in Amsterdam and in part by the Buffalo Historical Society. The forthcoming work will be vol. XXVIII. in the *Publications* series of the society.

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, described as "the oldest college of science and engineering in any English-speaking country", celebrated in October the hundredth anniversary of its foundation. In commemoration of the event Professor Ray P. Baker has published *A Chapter in American Education* (New York, Scribner's, pp. ix, 170), which is not only a sketch of the origins, aims, curricula, traditions, and achievements of the institute, but also an attempt to trace its influence upon certain phases of scientific and technical education throughout the United States.

Dr. C. E. Godfrey, director of the public record office of New Jersey, has prepared a compilation of the *County and Municipal Incorporations of the State of New Jersey* (Trenton, Public Record Office).

Among the articles in the October number of the *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society* are the Story of the Carterets, by Willis F. Johnson; Origin of the Name Succasunna, by Dr. Theodore F. Wolfe; Origin and Sketch of the "Jersey Blues", by William H. Benedict; a continuation of Dr. J. C. Honeyman's papers on Zion, St. Paul, and other Early Lutheran Churches in Central New Jersey; and a reprint from the *New Jersey Law Journal* (July–August, 1924) of an article by C. E. Godfrey on the Origin of the Counties in New Jersey.

The October number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* includes a study of the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1838, by Dr. Roy H. Akagi; an article on Some Old Gardens of Pennsylvania, by Dr. John W. Harshberger; the Diary of Elisha Williams, an adjutant in Ward's regiment (1776), contributed by W. Hyde Appleton; and the

concluding installment of the Provincial and Revolutionary History of St. Peter's Church, Philadelphia, 1753-1783, by C. P. B. Jefferys.

An attempt to help in solving the problem of teaching state history without interfering with the adequate study of United States history is made in *Pennsylvania History told by Contemporaries* (Macmillan), by Professors Asa E. Martin of the Pennsylvania State College and H. H. Shenk of Lebanon Valley College.

Among the *Papers* read before the Lancaster County Historical Society that of September 5 is by Hon. A. G. Seyfert on the History of Cedar Grove Presbyterian Church in East Earl Township. Those of October 3 are by W. F. Worner and describe visits of John Marshall, Daniel Webster, and others to Lancaster, though including matter not by any means restricted to those visits.

The October number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* contains a paper by Elizabeth McWilliams on Political Activities in Western Pennsylvania, 1800-1816; one by M. E. Stearns on Pittsburgh in the Mexican War; and an address by Professor Alfred P. James on the Mission and Importance of a Local Historical Magazine.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The contents of the September number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* include a sketch, by Dr. Bernard C. Steiner, of General John Spear Smith, first president of the Maryland Historical Society; Memoirs of the Rev. James Jones Wilmer (1750-1814), edited by J. Hall Pleasants; and some depositions in the land records (1785-1786), which shed light on the early history and topography of Baltimore.

Our Capital on the Potomac, by Miss Helen Nicolay, is the story of the city of Washington and its people from its early beginnings to the days of the Great War (Century Company).

The Southern Plantation: a Study in the Development and the Accuracy of a Tradition, by Frances Pendleton Gaines, appears in the series of Columbia University *Studies in English and Comparative Literature*.

The many Virginian parish records which have long been deposited in the library of the Episcopal Seminary near Alexandria have now been lent to the Virginia State Library, where they will be reproduced by photostat.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* prints in the October number, under the title, With Braddock's Army, portions of a diary kept by a Mrs. Browne, who accompanied her brother, a commissary officer attached to Braddock's expeditionary force, from London to Fort Cumberland. A photographic copy of the original, "Journal of a Voyage from London to Virginia, 1754", is in the Library of Congress, and the selections appearing in the *Magazine* are contributed and annotated by

Mr. Fairfax Harrison. Documents pertaining to the Virginia clergy in the early eighteenth century, edited by Rev. G. McLaren Brydon, are continued, as are other series hitherto noted.

Among the articles in the October number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* are: Duelling in Virginia, by R. R. Howison; Sketch of Plan for Endowment and Establishment of a State University of Virginia, taken from the *Richmond Enquirer* of Feb. 1, 1805; and a letter from Leonard Plunkett to William Byrd I.

The October number of *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* includes two papers by the editor, entitled Historical Antecedents, and the Annexation of Texas, respectively, and a continuation of the letters of William C. Rives to Thomas W. Gilmer.

The Conquest of Virginia: the First Attempt, by Conway W. Sams (the author, 308 Main Street, Norfolk, Virginia), is an account of Sir Walter Raleigh's colony on Roanoke Island, based on original records, and is a sequel to the author's earlier volume, *The Conquest of Virginia: the Forest Primeval*.

A History of Halifax County (Virginia), by W. J. Carrington, has been brought out in Richmond (Appeals Press).

The North Carolina Historical Commission, in its prosecution of the work of transcribing North Carolina records in the British Public Record Office, is at present making transcripts of the Loyalist Papers in so far as they pertain to North Carolina. Mr. R. B. House, sometime archivist of the North Carolina Historical Commission, has been chosen secretary of the commission to succeed the late Dr. D. H. Hill.

The October number of the *North Carolina Historical Review* contains a paper by C. C. Crittenden on the Surrender of the Charter of Carolina; one by Emma King on Some Aspects of the Work of the Society of Friends for Negro Education in North Carolina; and some documents pertaining to War Camp Community Service in North Carolina. Under a recent reorganization of the *Review* an advisory board of three editors has been created consisting of R. D. W. Connor, W. C. Jackson, and C. L. Coon. R. B. House continues as managing editor.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* offers in the July number the first installment of letters of William Smith, minister to Portugal, written principally from Lisbon in 1799. It is not indicated to whom the letters were addressed, but presumably to the Secretary of State (though marked "private"). Dr. Worthington C. Ford contributes a letter from John Rutledge to Benjamin Lincoln, Feb. 28, 1799, and there is a body of inscriptions from the churchyard of the Independent or Congregational Church at Wappetaw, Christ Church Parish, collected by Anne K. Gregorie, for which Miss Mabel L. Webber furnishes notes and comment.

Mr. Marion Dargan, of the University of Chicago, intending to write a life of William Henry Drayton, first chief justice of the state of South Carolina, would be glad to learn of letters or documents useful for such a study.

The *Georgia Historical Quarterly* of September contains an article by Mary Ross entitled the French on the Savannah, 1605; an account of the burning of Columbia, written by Madame Sophie Sosnowski, an eye-witness, with an introduction and notes by Lester Hargrett; a letter from Gonzalo Menéndez de Canço, governor of Florida, to Philip II., June 28, 1600, translated by Katherine Reding; and a Journal of James Tait, August, 1813, to March, 1814, pertaining to a military expedition against the Cherokees, with annotations by Peter A. Brannon.

A *History of the Public Domain in Georgia*, by S. G. McLendon, has been brought out in Atlanta by the author. It is based largely upon original sources, and is withal a rather sordid story.

The Florida Historical Society hopes before long to publish the late Miss Brevard's *History of Florida since 1821*, edited by Dr. J. A. Robertson. It has in proof-sheets the first volume of the *Colonial Records of Spanish Florida*, translated and edited by Mrs. Washington E. Connor. Progress is being made on the papers of Tristan de Luna, in the hands of Dr. Herbert I. Priestley, and on the *Cedulario* of Philip II. for Florida, 1580-1604, to be edited by Mr. John B. Stetson.

WESTERN STATES

The *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* for September presents papers on the National Significance of George Rogers Clark, by Temple Bodley, on the Peace Movement in North Carolina, by A. Sellew Roberts, Notes on the Economic History of New Orleans, 1803-1836, by James E. Winston, and on Points of Contact between History and Literature in the Mississippi Valley, by Dorothy Dondore. Letters of Joseph Price, on the road to California in 1850, are presented by Professor Thomas M. Marshall, and the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at Louisville, last May, is fully recorded.

The Indiana History Conference was held in Indianapolis December 5 and 6. One of the papers read at the conference was by Rev. Louis A. Warren of Morganfield, Ky., on Unused Materials for the Work of the Modern Historian. Mr. Warren has for some years been making a study of the historical materials pertaining to the family of Abraham Lincoln in Kentucky, and has in press (Bobbs-Merrill) a work in two volumes, the fruit of these studies. Another paper was by Dr. William E. Barton, of Oak Park, Ill., on the Lineage of Abraham Lincoln.

Articles in the September number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* are: Interurban Railroads of Indiana, by Glen A. Blackburn; History of Spiritualism in Indiana, by Anna Stockinger; Ripples of the

Blackhawk War in Northern Indiana, by Ella Lonn; and a continuation of the account of Early Vevay, by Perret Dufour.

Among the articles appearing in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* bearing the date April-July, 1923, are: the Northwestern Career of Jefferson Davis, by M. M. Quaife; Letters from Lyman Trumbull to John M. Palmer, 1854-1858, compiled and edited by Dr. George T. Palmer; Congregationalism in Springfield, by John H. Piper; New York and the Fusion Movement of 1860, by L. M. Sears; the Significance of Yorktown, by Charles H. MacDowell; the Pioneers of Macon County and the Civil War, by N. M. Baker; and Recollections of Mrs. Paul Selby.

Materials for Historical Research afforded by the University of Illinois Department of History is the title of *University of Illinois Bulletin*, vol. XX., no. 1.

The *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* includes among the contents of the October number three articles by Joseph J. Thompson, namely, a History of the Law in Illinois, Father Marquette's Second Journey to Illinois, and the Catholic Clergy in Illinois. A brief article on the Unification of the Ursulines bears the signature S. M. M.

The Argyle Settlement in History and Story, by Daniel G. Harvey, is the history of a Scottish settlement in Illinois (Rockford, Ill., the author).

The *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* has in the September number some Early Political Papers of Governor James T. Morehead, with an introduction and notes by Willard R. Jillson; the Tax Lists of Jefferson County, 1789; the Kentucky Militia, 1802-1816; and other documents.

Among the contents of the July number of the *Michigan History Magazine* are: Later Days in Dearborn, an address by Henry A. Haigh; the Archaeology of Michigan, by George R. Fox; and Impressions of Mackinac Island, 1837, reprinted from Mrs. Anna Jameson's *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles*. In the October number are found Mrs. Jameson's Impressions of Sault Ste. Marie; an article by W. W. Potter, entitled Fifty Years of Michigan Progress; and an account, by W. P. F. Ferguson, of the explorations made under his direction by the Franklin Isle Royale Expedition.

The *Burton Historical Collection Leaflet* of September is entitled Some Glimpses of Life in Ancient Detroit, being a collection of early documents, with an introduction by M. M. Quaife. The November number consists mainly of an article by Mr. Quaife on Detroit's Presidential Candidate (Lewis Cass).

Among the recent acquisitions of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin are a group of letters concerning Frances E. Willard, written by early friends and later associates, the gift of Mrs. F. S. Kent of Beloit, Wisconsin; photostatic copies (from originals gathered in Ten-

nessee by Mr. H. S. Cooper) of letters written from New Glarus, Wisconsin, during the Civil War by a German Swiss minister; and a group of letters to John H. Tweedy, representative in Congress from Wisconsin Territory, 1847-1848, the gift of his sister, Miss Marietta Tweedy. The society has in press Dr. Louise P. Kellogg's volume on *The French Régime in Wisconsin and the Northwest*.

The September number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* contains a valuable contribution by Dr. Joseph Schafer on Know-Nothingism in Wisconsin; an account, by Samuel M. Pedrick, of the Early History of Ripon College, 1850-1864; a paper by Mabel V. Hansen on the Swedish Settlement on Pine Lake; and an Account of the Norwegian Settlers in North America, translated by Knut Gjerset from a report by Consul General Adam Løvenskjold to the Norwegian government, Oct. 15, 1847, describing his visit in the preceding summer to the Norwegian settlements in the United States. Among the articles in the December number are: Copper Mining in the Early Northwest, by Miss Louise P. Kellogg; the History of the Silo in Wisconsin, by N. S. Fish; a sketch of Philo White, an early Wisconsin editor, by John G. Gregory; and Wisconsin Troops at the Defense of Washington in 1861, by C. O. Paullin. In the section of documents, besides the conclusion of A. W. Kellogg's *Recollections of Life in Early Wisconsin*, is an installment of the *Journal of a World War Veteran*, Ira L. Paterson.

Some recent accessions of the Minnesota Historical Society are: documents relating to Ramsay Crooks, president of the American Fur Company; additions to the Gideon Pond Papers; a section of an uncompleted autobiography of Henry H. Sibley, and a diary of Sibley during his expedition of 1863 against the Sioux Indians; photostat copies of Red River census records for a few years between 1838 and 1847; and some material on the attitude of the Minnesota Democrats in the election of 1860.

The *Minnesota History Bulletin* bearing the date August-November, 1922, "issued in October, 1924", contains an address by Professor Clarence W. Alvord, entitled *When Minnesota was a Pawn of International Politics*; an account, by Theodore C. Blegen, of the State Historical Convention at Duluth, July, 1922; and the *Diary of Martin McLeod, 1836-1841*, edited, with introduction and notes, by Miss Grace L. Nute. McLeod's diary is of particular interest for the reason that it pertains largely to the filibustering expedition of James Dickson, in which McLeod was an officer.

Articles in the October number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* are: the Beginnings of Dutch Immigration to Iowa, 1845-1847, by Henry S. Lucas; *Some Early Educational Leaders in Iowa*, by Clarence R. Aurner; and the *Omaha Pool*, by Robert E. Riegel.

The State Historical Society of Iowa has published a bulletin on *State and Local History in the High School*, by Bruce E. Mahan.

The principal articles in the April number of the *Annals of Iowa* are: Driving Cattle from Texas to Iowa, 1866, being a diary of George C. Duffield, with an introduction by W. W. Baldwin; a sketch of Thomas Gregg, Local Historian and Author, by David C. Mott; the seventh installment of the Writings of Judge George G. Wright; and a description of the battle of Blue Mills (Sept. 17, 1861), by Capt. Charles P. Brown.

The September number of the *Palimpsest* includes a sketch of Henry C. Bean (1822-1887), minister and lawyer, by George F. Robeson. The October number contains brief articles from different pens on various phases of Iowa history.

The Missouri Historical Society has recently received a large addition to the P. Chouteau Maffitt Collection, comprising twenty-eight bound volumes of manuscript and over two thousand separate pieces, ranging from 1822 to 1865, and relating to the operations of the American Fur Company, Farnham and Davenport, and Prince Paul of Württemberg; also a large collection of papers concerning slavery, 1787-1861, especially letters and journals of overseers of plantations in Florida; and original sketch-books of Henry Lewis, painter of scenes along the Mississippi River about 1849.

The October number of the *Missouri Historical Review* includes a paper by Lillie Franklin, entitled Rochefort, Missouri, an Illustration of Economic Adjustment to Environment; one by R. E. Riegel on the Southwestern Pool, a chapter in railroad history; a sketch of Uriel Wright, a prominent lawyer of St. Louis of ante-bellum days, being the fourth of Mr. Daniel M. Grissom's series of Personal Recollections of Distinguished Missourians. Mr. W. B. Stevens's studies of the New Journalism in Missouri are continued.

Important accessions to the manuscript collections of the University of Texas are a body of letters of the Addison family, papers of Lieut. Edward Burleson, some letters of J. D. B. DeBow, editor of *DeBow's Review*, and the Stand Watie Papers. The Addison letters (1838-1876) are the correspondence of members of a family in which there were several Methodist ministers, and cast interesting light on educational and religious life in Texas. The Burleson Papers are particularly valuable on the side of party politics during the Civil War and reconstruction, and also for their bearing upon the question of frontier defense against the Indians, 1821-1876. A few of the manuscripts pertain to the establishment of Texan independence. The letters of DeBow (1865-1866) relate to the business of the *Review*. The Stand Watie Papers are those of a Cherokee Indian who, born in Georgia, became a leader of his people in the Indian Territory, lived for a time in Washington City, where he aided in the settlement of land claims of the Cherokees, and became a brigadier-general in the Confederate army. Some of the papers are concerned with the relation of the Cherokees to the Confederate government.

The Nebraska State Historical Society announces as the result of one of the several geographical studies and explorations carried out under the direction of the society, that the Pawnee village where Lieutenant Pike ordered down the Spanish colors and raised the American flag on Sept. 29, 1806, has been identified by Mr. A. T. Hill and Superintendent Sheldon with a point on the Republican River in Nebraska between Guide Rock and Red Cloud, some thirty miles distant from the monument erected in 1901 by the state of Kansas. The outcome of another of the society's studies has been the identification of the route of the Villazur expedition of 1720 with the topography of the country in the Platte Valley.

The June number of the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* contains an interesting account of the Medicine Lodge Peace Council of 1867, from the pen of Hon. A. A. Taylor, recently governor of Tennessee. Mr. Taylor, whose father, Nathaniel G. Taylor, was president of the government commission, accompanied the commission as assistant secretary, and is therefore relating principally his personal recollections. Other articles are: the Centennial of Fort Gibson, by Grant Foreman, and Warren's Trading Post, by W. H. Clift. There also appears in this number, under the title, the Cherokee Question, a reprint of a report of the commissioner of Indian affairs, 1866, with a number of related documents, for which J. B. Thoburn writes an introduction and notes.

In the November number of the *Colorado Magazine* appears a paper by A. B. Thomas on Spanish Expeditions into Colorado.

The State of Wyoming Historical Department's *Quarterly Bulletin* of November 1 contains some reminiscences of George W. T. Beck; part of a diary of Major A. B. Ostrander, with an account of handling the mail at Fort Reno in 1866 and 1867; reminiscences of Forts Reno and Phil Kearney, by Major J. Van Voast; and an historical sketch of Sheridan County, by J. D. Loucks.

Mr. Alfred V. Kidder, in a substantial illustrated quarto volume, called *An Introduction to the Study of Southwestern Archaeology*, presents the results of excavations which for nine years past the department of archaeology of Phillips Andover Academy has been carrying on at the important pueblo of Pecos, New Mex., and of other investigations of cliff-dwellings, pueblos, and cave-cemeteries in the same general region.

The principal articles in the October number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* are: Reminiscences of Joseph H. Boyd, an Argonaut of 1857, recorded and arranged by W. S. Lewis; Oregon's Provisional Post Office, by W. M. Underhill; and the Oregon Mint, by T. E. Strevey.

The September number of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* contains a paper by Frank B. Gill on Oregon's First Railway (the Oregon portage railroad at the cascades of the Columbia River),

and the first installment of a History of the Oregon and California Railroad, by John T. Ganoe.

The October number of the *California History Nugget* contains a short article giving some account of California's Early Transportation and Mail Service, and another treating of some phases of the constitutional convention of 1849.

The Arthur H. Clark Company has brought out *The Inside Passage to Alaska, 1792-1920: with an Account of the North Pacific Coast from Cape Mendocino to Cook Inlet*, in two volumes, by William W. Woollen. It is further indicated in the subtitle that the story is derived "from the accounts left by Vancouver and other early explorers, and from the author's journals of exploration and travel in that region". The work is edited by Paul L. Haworth.

The Yale University Press has issued, under the title *Around the Horn to the Sandwich Islands and California, 1845-1850*, a journal of travel kept by Chester S. Lyman, formerly professor of astronomy and physics in Yale University—a volume understood to be of great interest, especially with regard to the discovery of gold in California.

CANADA

The principal articles in the *Canadian Historical Review* for September are one on the Tragedy of Chief Justice Livius, by Professor A. L. Burt, and one on Some American Influences upon the Canadian Federation Movement, by Professor Reginald G. Trotter. A body of documents respecting the annexation movement of 1849-1850 is printed, and there is a brief account of the annual meeting, last May, of the Canadian Historical Association.

The Literary and Historical Society of Quebec has commemorated its completion of a hundred years of life by issuing *The Centenary Volume of the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec, 1824-1924* (Quebec, L'Événement Press). The principal content of the volume is a history of the society, by Dr. Henry Ievers, including some letters of Lord Dalhousie, 1823, which constituted the first steps toward the organization of the society. The volume also includes, however, some historical documents which do not pertain directly to the life of the society, among them Wellington's report on the defense of Canada (1819), letters of Dalhousie (1820-1825), some materials relative to General Wolfe, etc.

The firm of Dent in London has published *Canadian Federation: its Origins and Achievement* (pp. xiv, 348), by Reginald G. Trotter, now of Queen's University.

The Ontario Book Company has brought out a small volume bearing the title *Tecumseh and Richardson: the Story of a Trip to Walpole*

Island and Port Sarnia, by Major John Richardson, with an introduction and biographical sketch by A. H. U. Colquhoun, deputy minister of education of Ontario. John Richardson, a native of British America, was a "gentleman volunteer" in the 41st British regiment and was taken prisoner at the battle of the Thames. He afterward saw service on the Continent (attaining to the rank of major), but spent the later years of his life writing historical sketches and novels. His best known historical work is *The War of 1812* (Brockville, 1842), but he is more widely known as the author of the novel, *Wacousta* (London, 1833). "The Story of a Trip to Walpole Island and Port Sarnia", recently discovered as an anonymous contribution to a Canadian magazine, is an account of an expedition in 1848 to distribute presents among the Indians of the Walpole reservation. The story has an especial interest for its incorporation of a version of the death and burial of Tecumseh. Besides the sketch of the career of Major Richardson, Dr. Colquhoun has contributed to the volume an interesting account of the career and qualities of Tecumseh.

AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

A prize offered by the Cuban Academy of History for the best monograph on the history of Havana in the seventeenth century has been awarded to Miss Irene A. Wright, of Seville. The monograph is to be published by the Academy. The Academy has now published in a separate form the first volume, 1822-1832 (pp. xvii, 188), of the *Centón Epistolario* of Domingo del Monte, literary and other correspondence of noted Cubans, edited by Señor Domingo Figarola-Caneda—hitherto printed in parts in the *Anales*.

Mr. Cunninghame Graham's *The Conquest of the River Plate* (Doubleday, Page, and Company) follows the attractive method and style of his *Conquest of New Granada*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. H. Eliel, *Freedom of Speech* (American Political Science Review, November); Charles Moore, *The Stepfatherhood of George Washington* (Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine, November); J. R. Nichols, ed., *The Doughboy of 1780: Pages from a Revolutionary Diary* (Atlantic Monthly, October); C. C. Tansill, *The Treaty-Making Powers of the Senate* (American Journal of International Law, July); F. Baldensperger, *Le Séjour de Talleyrand aux États-Unis* (Revue de Paris, November 15); Major E. N. McClellan, *The Birthday of the U. S. Marine Corps* (Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine, November); A. H. Monroe, *The Supreme Court and the Constitution* (American Political Science Review, November); Paul Wilstach, *Reconciliation: Correspondence of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson* (Atlantic Monthly, December); W. G. Bean, *An Aspect of Know-Nothingism: the Immigrant and Slavery* (South Atlantic Quarterly, October); Gerhard Menz, *Die Chinapolitik*

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXX.—29.

der Vereinigten Staaten und der Völkerbundgedanke (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, August); A. H. Appelmann, *Die Amerikaner am Rhein* (Deutsche Rundschau, October); W. J. Adams, *Evolution of Law in North Carolina* (North Carolina Law Review, April); R. P. Bieber, *The Papers of James J. Webb, Sante Fé Merchant, 1844-1861* (Washington University Studies, XI. 2); Konrad von Hippel, *Der Panama-Kanal* (Preussische Jahrbücher, August); Manuel S. Sánchez, *The Origin of the Printing-Press in Venezuela* (Inter-America, December); Carlos Brandt, *Universal Peace: the Work of Bolívar* (*ibid.*, October); F. B. Simkins, *Guzmán Blanco: an Appreciation* (South Atlantic Quarterly, October); César A. Ugarte, *The Economic Life of Ancient Perú* (Inter-America, December); C. Bertacchi, *La Terra del Fuoco nel Libro di un Missionario Italiano* (Nuova Antologia, September 1).